



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

Theses and Dissertations

Thesis Collection

1999-12

Evaluating policy alternatives for the reengineering
of the Department of Defense Personal Property
Shipment and Storage Program -- a stakeholder approach

Lepson, Michael D.

Monterey, California ; Naval Postgraduate School



Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



THESIS

**EVALUATING POLICY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE
REENGINEERING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PERSONAL PROPERTY SHIPMENT AND STORAGE
PROGRAM — A STAKEHOLDER APPROACH**

by

Michael D. Lepson

December 1999

Principal Advisor:

Nancy C. Roberts

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

20000313 016

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

**EVALUATING POLICY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE REENGINEERING
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONAL PROPERTY
SHIPMENT AND STORAGE PROGRAM — A
STAKEHOLDER APPROACH**

Michael D. Lepson
Captain, United States Marine Corps
B.A., The American University, 1988

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 1999**

Author:

Michael D. Lepson

Approved by:

Nancy C. Roberts, Principal Advisor

Cary A. Simon, Associate Advisor

Reuben T. Harris, Chairman,
Department of Systems Management

ABSTRACT

The Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) is currently reengineering the DOD Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program. DOD is conducting three pilot projects in support of this effort. Each pilot project represents a policy alternative for improving moving services for military families. The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics) tasked United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) to evaluate the personal property pilot programs as part of Management Reform Memorandum # 6. This thesis evaluates the policy alternatives for reengineering the DOD personal property program using a stakeholder approach.

The study develops a model and establishes criteria for evaluating the three policy alternatives. Values are determined for the criteria by interviewing a sample of stakeholders from business, government, and customers. Policy alternatives are then analyzed from each stakeholder perspective. Finally, a policy alternative is identified that best satisfies the criteria for each stakeholder as well as the aggregate of stakeholders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. | PERSONAL PROPERTY SHIPMENT AND STORAGE PROGRAM | 1 |
| 1. | Background of Reengineering Effort | 1 |
| 2. | Organization of the Personal Property Program..... | 3 |
| B. | DESCRIPTION OF PILOT PROJECTS..... | 4 |
| 1. | MTMC Reengineering Effort..... | 5 |
| 2. | Sailor Arrangement Move (SAM)..... | 7 |
| 3. | Full Service Move Program (FSMP)..... | 8 |
| 4. | DoD Pilot Project Evaluation Process..... | 9 |
| 5. | Summary | 12 |
| C. | PURPOSE OF THESIS | 14 |
| D. | RESEARCH QUESTIONS | 14 |
| E. | SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY | 14 |
| F. | LIMITATIONS | 15 |
| G. | ORGANIZATION OF STUDY | 16 |
| II. | LITERATURE REVIEW | 17 |
| A. | INTRODUCTION..... | 17 |
| B. | POLICY ANALYSIS IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR | 17 |
| C. | MODEL FOR EVALUATING POLICY ALTERNATIVES..... | 19 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 1. | State the Problem..... | 20 |
| 2. | Identify Solutions | 21 |
| 3. | Develop Evaluation Criteria..... | 22 |
| 4. | Evaluate Solutions Based on Criteria..... | 23 |
| 5. | Recommend the Preferred Alternative..... | 23 |
| D. | APPLICATION OF MODEL TO STUDY..... | 24 |
| 1. | Identify Problem..... | 25 |
| 2. | Identify Solutions | 26 |
| 3. | Develop Criteria | 26 |
| 4. | Evaluate Policy Alternatives | 27 |
| 5. | Recommend Preferred Alternative..... | 27 |
| E. | CHAPTER SUMMARY | 28 |
| III. | METHODOLOGY | 29 |
| A. | INTRODUCTION..... | 29 |
| B. | RESEARCH FOCUS | 29 |
| C. | IDENTIFY GOALS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY PROGRAM REENGINEERING EFFORT | 31 |
| D. | ESTABLISH EVALUATION CRITERIA | 34 |
| E. | ASSESS POLICY ALTERNATIVES | 39 |
| F. | STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS PROCESS..... | 44 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | Identification of Stakeholders | 45 |
| 2. | Determining Values Stakeholders Place on Evaluation Criteria..... | 48 |
| G. | CHAPTER SUMMARY | 53 |
| IV. | DATA..... | 55 |
| A. | INTRODUCTION..... | 55 |
| B. | STATISTICAL MEASURES | 55 |
| 1. | Improve the Servicemember's Quality of Life..... | 56 |
| 2. | Reduce Total Cost of the Personal Property Program..... | 60 |
| 3. | Maintain a Competitive Market | 64 |
| C. | CHAPTER SUMMARY | 67 |
| V. | DATA ANALYSIS | 69 |
| A. | INTRODUCTION..... | 69 |
| B. | EVALUATION OF POLICY ALTERNATIVES..... | 69 |
| 1. | Evaluation of Aggregate..... | 70 |
| 2. | Evaluation of Government Stakeholder Group | 72 |
| 3. | Evaluation of Transportation Provider Stakeholder Sub- Group..... | 73 |
| 4. | Evaluation of Relocation Manager Stakeholder Sub- Group..... | 74 |
| 5. | Evaluation of Industry Stakeholder Group..... | 74 |
| 6. | Evaluation of Servicemember Stakeholder Group..... | 75 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| C. | CHAPTER SUMMARY | 76 |
| VI. | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 77 |
| A. | INTRODUCTION | 77 |
| B. | RESTATEMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS | 77 |
| C. | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 78 |
| D. | LIMITATIONS | 80 |
| 1. | Scope Limitations | 80 |
| 2. | Institutional Obstacles | 81 |
| 3. | Technical Obstacles | 82 |
| E. | GENERAL COMMENTS | 83 |
| F. | RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY | 84 |
| APPENDIX A. | DEFINITIONS | 87 |
| APPENDIX B. | QUESTIONNAIRE | 91 |
| APPENDIX C. | INTERVIEW RESPONSES | 93 |
| APPENDIX D. | ANALYSIS | 101 |
| | LIST OF REFERENCES | 109 |
| | BIBLIOGRAPHY | 113 |
| | INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST | 121 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Figure 1. | Pilot Project Hierarchy | 5 |
| Figure 2. | Program Comparison..... | 13 |
| Figure 3. | Generic Policy Evaluation Model | 19 |
| Figure 4. | Proposed Policy Evaluation Model | 20 |
| Figure 5. | Methodology Overview..... | 25 |
| Figure 6. | Overview of Chapter III | 30 |
| Figure 7. | Goals for Reengineering Personal Property Program | 33 |
| Figure 8. | Goals and Evaluation Criteria | 37 |
| Figure 9. | Goals and Evaluation Criteria | 41 |
| Figure 10. | Value of Criteria for Each Pilot Project | 43 |
| Figure 11. | Stakeholder Map..... | 46 |
| Figure 12. | Data Analysis Overview..... | 69 |
| Figure 13. | Aggregate Total Difference..... | 71 |
| Figure 14. | Government Total Difference..... | 72 |
| Figure 15. | Transportation Providers Total Difference..... | 73 |
| Figure 16. | Relocation Managers Total Difference | 74 |
| Figure 17. | Industry Total Difference | 75 |
| Figure 18. | Servicemembers Total Difference..... | 76 |

I. INTRODUCTION

A. PERSONAL PROPERTY SHIPMENT AND STORAGE PROGRAM

The Department of Defense (DoD) Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program is a \$1 billion dollar program managed for the military services by the Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC). DoD is the moving and storage industry's single largest customer, with over 650,000 shipments a year -- approximately 15 percent of the moving industry business (Moore, 1995). The servicemember's quality of life is effected over 650,000 times a year by the policies that govern the movement and storage of their possessions. Over a military career, a servicemember is typically required to move more than 20 times (Moore, 1995).

1. Background of Reengineering Effort

The DoD's Quality of Life Task Force, established by Secretary of Defense William J. Perry and under the leadership of Mr. John O. Marsh, a former secretary of the Army, mandated that systems be simplified, the quality of service for the servicemember be improved and, most of all, that members be satisfied customers of DoD's services. The National Performance Review and the Acquisition Reform Initiative have also recognized the need for DoD to improve the processes used to regulate and manage commercial programs.

Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) William S. Cohen, in his Defense Reform Initiative Report, November 1997, stated that the Department must do a better job of moving DoD servicemembers and their families to their new duty stations. The report

states in part, "...despite the fact that DoD moves more household effects than any United States corporation, the system we have created to do the moving has given our personnel some of the worst service in the nation (Cohen, 1997)." Improving the current personal property program remains a critical quality of life issue, and is listed as one of the SECDEF's nine Defense Reform Initiatives.

Under the current program, many shipments are delayed, lost, stranded, burned, and damaged (Moore, 1995). Servicemembers and their families consistently experience poor service from movers, excessive incidence of loss or damage to their property, and a laborious claims process (GAO/NSIAD-97-49, 1996, p. 1). The failures of the current program have caused hardships throughout the military for servicemembers and their families.

MTMC is currently reengineering the program to improve the quality of these moves and reduce costs, while attempting to not adversely impact industry. Efforts to reengineer the personal property program have involved numerous governmental and industry organizations including Congress, the Secretary of Defense, the Military Services, industry trade associations, and individual transportation service providers. Though MTMC has oversight of the reengineering pilots under the cognizance of the United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM), MTMC, the Army and the Navy are each responsible for conducting separate pilots to evaluate policy alternatives.

2. Organization of the Personal Property Program

MTMC is a jointly staffed, major Army command under USTRANSCOM.

While MTMC is responsible for the overall operation of the Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program, each Service runs offices that provide customer support to servicemembers in the process of moving. MTMC serves as the single contracting authority for personal property.

Although the DoD's domestic personal property program functions under centralized MTMC management, operations are carried out at 153 Military Service-managed Personal Property Shipping Offices (PPSOs) (Beyer and Schwartz, 1993, p. 1-2).¹ Approximately 1,100 commercial carriers move the household goods of military members throughout the United States each year.

Every six months, MTMC solicits bids from carriers for specific domestic traffic lanes (routes). In response, MTMC receives more than 1.1 million bids for domestic movements from commercial carriers. Rates, based on poundage, mileage, packing, labor, and storage, are established and proffered to moving and storage companies by a MTMC contracting officer.

A successful bid to MTMC's solicitation places the contractor on a local area listing. A rotational system is used by PPSOs to equitably distribute business among accepted carriers. Every domestic PPSO maintains a Traffic Distribution Record (TDR)

¹ The 153 PPSOs in the United States consist of 45 Army, 30 Navy, 609 Air Forces, and 9 Marine Corps. The Coast Guard also operates 21 PPSOs.

on which it records shipment awards. The TDR lists carriers according to their filed rates, with the lowest rate carriers listed first.

The moving industry contains van lines with agent networks, independent carriers, agents, and forwarders. Six major carriers dominate the moving industry. In 1996, these carriers accounted for 83 percent of the market. Many small businesses in the moving industry are agents for one of the major carriers. Many carriers create "paper companies" to bid and gain a higher percentage of the traffic allocation while the parent company conducts the move.

B. DESCRIPTION OF PILOT PROJECTS

Since 1994, DoD has been engaged in initiatives to reengineer the personal property program. On June 21, 1994, the Deputy Commander-in-Chief, USTRANSCOM, directed the Army component of USTRANSCOM, the Military Traffic Management Command and program manager for DoD's Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program, to reengineer the personal property program (GAO/NSAID-97-49, p. 30). MTMC's initial efforts met with strong industry resistance and heightened congressional interest. On June 15, 1995, the House Committee on National Security, concurred that DoD must pursue a higher level of service, and directed that DoD undertake a pilot program to implement commercial business practices and standards of service.

Based on congressional language in the Fiscal Year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act, DoD eventually developed three pilot programs to reengineer the

Household Goods movement process (Personal Property Program Management Reform Memorandum #6, 1999). These pilots are 1) the Military Traffic Management Command pilot; 2) the Navy's Servicemember Arranged Moves (SAM) pilot; and 3) the Army's Hunter Airfield pilot which was later expanded into the Full Service Moving Project (FSMP). Figure 1 provides an organizational overview of the pilot project hierarchy.




Figure 1. Pilot Project Hierarchy

1. MTMC Reengineering Effort

The MTMC project is attempting to reengineer the current program in order to improve the move process. MTMC's pilot aims to significantly improve the quality assurance and procurement methods of the personal property program through the use

of a Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)-based "best value" contract. The key features of this program include selecting carriers based on servicemember satisfaction and past performance rather than simply price; achieving stronger carrier commitment with long-term contracts; and offering full replacement value protection and direct claims settlement.

MTMC's final contract solicitation for this pilot was released 14 March 1997. Although MTMC received proposals in June 1997, pilot implementation was delayed due to strong industry resistance and Congressional concerns. Concerned about the impact that the competition system and any nonstandard commercial business practice requirements might have on small businesses, the statement of managers accompanying the 1997 DoD Authorization Act directed that DoD report on the impact of the pilot program on small business (Warren, 1999). After reviewing the defense reports on small business impact, the House Committee on National Security was still concerned that MTMC's pilot program did not satisfactorily address issues raised by small moving companies. As a result, Congress directed that the Secretary of Defense establish a working group of military and industry representatives to develop an alternative pilot project (Warren, 1999).

Although the working group reached a consensus on many issues, including a set of program goals, it could not reach agreement on the approach to take for the pilot test (Warren, 1999). Consequently, the two sides presented separate proposals. In November 1996, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that MTMC's

proposal met the goals of reengineering the personal property program to a greater extent than the industry plan (GAO/NSIAD-97-49, p. 4).

The MTMC pilot program implementation, delayed by numerous bid protests, finally commenced in January 1999. The pilot reengineers the existing program for 50 percent of the moves originating in three states: North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida. The pilot runs concurrently with the existing MTMC-managed program at the installations in the three states and will involve approximately 18,500 annual moves (Warren, 1999). The pilot is scheduled to run for one-year with two one-year option periods. (BGen. Privratsky Information Paper, 1999).

2. Sailor Arrangement Move (SAM)

The Department of Navy initiated a separate pilot effort in 1997 to test the option of allowing servicemembers to choose their own carrier as well as coordinate their move with that carrier. The Servicemember Arranged Move (SAM) pilot is a low volume pilot based on voluntary participation featuring payment for services by an international merchant's procurement authorization card (IMPAC). The servicemember selects a mover from a list of carriers that are self-certified as small businesses and approved by MTMC. Servicemembers are then able to coordinate the move directly with the mover.

Commencing in January 1998, the option is offered for shipments originating in the areas surrounding Puget Sound, Washington; San Diego, California; Norfolk, Virginia; and Groton, Connecticut (GAO/T-NSIAD-99-106, 1999, p. 4). Eligible participants must limit shipments to at least 3,000 pounds and to costs between \$2,500

and \$25,000 (Warren, 1999). Furthermore, this pilot excludes shipments from non-temporary storage or warehouses.

The pilot is not intended to replace the existing MTMC-managed program and is limited to Navy military members with permanent change of station orders from the participating site. Attempts to expand the program to include all servicemembers and DoD civilians, and to incorporate additional objectives were not approved.

3. Full Service Move Program (FSMP)

Separate from the MTMC pilot program, the Department of the Army is attempting to determine whether the commercial business practice of outsourcing can alleviate known problem areas. The pilot was initiated in February 1996 as a Quality of Life initiative to improve the relocation process and to test commercial business practices in a military environment (Warren, 1999). The pilot effects a total of 1,400 annual moves that originate at the Hunter Army Airfield, Savannah, Georgia.

On January 31, 1997, the Army selected PHH Relocation (now called Cendant Mobility) as the contractor for the pilot. Cendant Mobility is the largest relocation/move management company in the world. In July 1997, Cendant Mobility began providing relocation services at Hunter Army Airfield. These services consisted of point-to-point move management, personal move counseling and coordination, 24 hour in-transit visibility of the shipment, direct claims settlement with the service member, full replacement value insurance, and a single point of contact for the servicemember (Warren, 1999). Additional relocation management services were optional to soldiers and included services such as home finding for buyers and renters,

mortgage services, marketing services for home selling, and property management. Throughout the entire relocation process, the contractor's move counselor is the soldier's single point of contact, from origin to destination, from entitlements counseling to claims settlement (LGen. Coburn, 1999).

The initial Hunter Test was for one year, ending 30 June 1998. At the end of the initial test, an extension option was exercised for another year. On February 12, 1999, DoD stated that it intended to expand the Hunter Test into the Full Service Moving Project (FSMP) with certain modifications based on earlier lessons learned from the Hunter Test. Moreover, the Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Transportation Policy took over sponsorship of the pilot from the Army. When fully implemented, FSMP will involve all military Services as well as the Coast Guard. Test areas in consideration are Georgia, North Dakota, and the National Capital Region, which include approximately 45,000 annual moves. The project will allow DoD to test and evaluate a larger move volume as well as Service-unique requirements under the commercial business practice concept (FSMP Overview, 1999). The FSMP is expected to commence in late 1999.

4. DoD Pilot Project Evaluation Process

The USTRANSCOM is tasked by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics) with overseeing all personal property pilots, ensuring consistency in evaluation criteria and assessment, evaluating the pilots to determine which pilots or tests, or portions thereof, could provide better long-term results, and then recommending the follow-on course of action and time line for implementation

throughout DoD (Evaluation Plan for Reengineered DoD Personal Property Pilot, SAM, and DoD FSMP, 1999). Presently, USTRANSCOM is working with the services to develop a common set of data measures to evaluate the pilot project's results (GAO/T-NSIAD-99-106, p. 5).

Evaluation methodology currently concentrates on four main areas: quality of life, costs, impacts on small business, and process improvement innovations (LGen. Thompson, 1999). Quality of life is the most heavily weighted of the four factors and will be measured by the servicemember's direct feedback as to whether he/she would use that carrier again (LGen. Thompson, 1999). Total cost includes direct and indirect costs. Direct costs include contracted services and goods such as transportation, storage and accessorial services. The indirect baseline cost includes management of the personal property program, quality assurance, financial transaction processing, and additional systems operations and maintenance costs. The third factor considered, the impact on small business, will be measured against the Small Business Act, Public Law 855536 that establishes a government-wide goal for small business participation at not less than 23 percent revenue (LGen. Thompson, 1999). The USTRANSCOM evaluation program will also identify unique features of each pilot program that substantially improves the service to the customer. These features include, but are not limited to: the use of move management services, electronic data interchange capability and payment features.

Although standard data will be collected from each pilot, the specific methods of data collection may differ somewhat from program to program (LGen. Thompson, 1999). Furthermore, data will be collected and compiled for each pilot by a different organization. The initial Hunter pilot used Electronic Data Systems (EDS) to evaluate servicemember quality of life, cost, and small business participation as compared to the current household goods move process. The FMSP will use the installation transportation office / traffic management office (TMO) and the relocation service contractor to collect the baseline and test data. This data will be compiled and validated by the Army Audit Agency. The SAM program will have the naval base personal property shipment offices compile the baseline and test data. This data will be forwarded to and validated by the Naval Audit Service. GAO has repeatedly recommended that the Secretary of Defense develop a comprehensive strategy to test each of the policy alternatives (GAO/NSIAD-99-138, 1999, p. 8).

Ultimately, all test data will be forwarded to USTRANSOM for evaluation. A USTRANSCOM contractor will design and conduct surveys, develop and implement the evaluation plan, and prepare an integrated recommendation plan for a new DoD personal property program (Evaluation Support for DoD's Personal Property Reengineering Programs Statement of Work, 1999). An integrated product process team (IPPT), composed the O-5/O-6 level representatives from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, USTRANSCOM, the Services, DoD Inspector General, and

Audit Agencies will analyze the comparative test data, develop options, and forward them to an Executive Working Group (EWG).

The EWG will consist of Flag/General Officer level representatives from USTRANSCOM, the Services and OSD (LGen. Thompson, 1999). The charter of the EWG is to make final recommendations for a new DoD personal property program to Commander-in-Chief (CINC), USTRANSCOM (LGen. Thompson, 1999).

CINC, USTRANSCOM will approve or make modifications to EWG's recommendation(s) after a review. As the DoD Executive Agent for the evaluation of all DoD personal property pilot programs, CINC, USTRANSCOM will submit a final recommendation(s) to the Secretary of Defense by December 2000.

5. Summary

Since 1994, DoD has pursued initiatives to reengineer the personal property program. DoD has attempted to involve industry in these efforts, but there has been minimal agreement on pilot characteristics. DoD is currently testing three different approaches to reengineering the personal property program under separate pilot projects. Figure 2 summarizes the characteristics of these pilots. These projects effect approximately 21,000 annual moves. The expansion of the Hunter pilot into the FSMF will increase participation in the pilots to approximately 66,000 annual moves or 10 percent of total annual moves.² Final recommendations will be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense from CINC, USTRANSCOM by December 2000.

² The personal property program covers approximately 650,000 annual moves.

SAM

- FAR-based contract-commercial LOA
- Full Value Protection (Maximum \$72K)
- Direct claims settlement w/ carrier
- Claim settlement w/in 60
- Carriers approved and in good standing with HQMTMC
- Inclusion of the Service Contract Act
- Inconvenience payments
- Customer satisfaction surveys
- Tailored pre-move counseling by PPSO
- Shipment tracking (ITV) establishment of a toll free # to be manned five days a week (M-F) from 0700 to 1800 Central Time
- Use of Pagers to support direct delivery
- Pricing strategy based on commercial tariff
- Weight restrictions reduced from 3000 to 1000 lbs. For (HHG)
- SIT increased from 90 days to 360 days
- Servicemember chooses carrier from among available participating carriers
- Servicemember may interview and/or visit carrier
- Carriers may service any or all channels
- 100% small business
- Government Credit Card payment

Hunter (FSMP)

- FAR-based contract
- Full Replacement Protection (Maximum \$75K)
- Direct claims settlement w/ move manager
- Claims settlement w/in 30 days
- The Contractor obtains est. for determining the replacement value/repair cost of the property
- Transportation provider qualifications:
 - Financial stability
 - Ensured capacity
 - Past performance standards
 - Loss/damage prevention measures
- Guaranteed on-time pick-up and delivery
- Inconvenience payments
- Move Manager qualifications:
 - Performance risk assessment
 - Past performance
 - Ability to meet SOW requirements
- Monthly Move Analysis Report
- Pre-move counseling
- Point to point move management
- Binding Estimates for excess costs
- Destination information
- Shipment tracking via a toll-free # and an electronic address. Service shall be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
- Real Estate Services
- Domestic pricing based on commercial tariff
- International pricing based on Single Factor Rate
- Transportation providers pay commissions to move managers
- Distribution based on Quality
- Use of move management service
- 1 year agreement with transportation providers
- 2 year contract w/ 3 option years with move manager
- Contractor required to meet small business goals in accordance with SBA
- Use Bank Service to pay

MTMC

- FAR-based contract
- Full Replacement Protection (Maximum \$63K)
- Claims settlement w/ Government
- The Contractor obtains est. for determining the replacement value/repair cost of the property
- Carrier qualifications
 - Committed Daily Capacity
 - Past performance standards
 - Established quality measures
 - Personnel requirements
 - Carriers evaluated on on-time pickup & delivery and damage rates
- Inconvenience payments
- Use of Customer Survey
- Quarterly performance reviews
- Claims Activity Report
- Pre-move counseling
- Shipment tracking (ITV) toll free # that is operational 7 days a week, 24 hrs/day. Must response during working hours.
- Pricing Strategy based on commercial tariff
- Traffic allocated on a rotational capacity to the contract min. guaranties meet then on best value
- EDI: Transportation Operational Personal Property Standard System (PTOPS)
- Payment through DFAS
- Compliance with SBA

Figure 2. Program Comparison

C. PURPOSE OF THESIS

The DoD is planning or conducting three pilot projects to reengineer its personal property shipping program. Each pilot project represents policy alternatives for improving moving services for military families. MTMC is responsible for evaluating all of the pilots; its intention is to determine which one could provide better long-term service (GAO/NIAD-99-138, pg. 2).

D. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The primary research question of this thesis is: **Which policy alternative for reengineering the DoD's personal property program best satisfies stakeholder criteria?**

Subsidiary research questions supporting this issue are:

1. What are the policy alternatives for reengineering the personal property program?
2. What are the criteria for evaluating for policy alternatives?
3. Who are the stakeholders for the reengineering effort?
4. What value do the stakeholders place on the evaluation criteria?
5. Which policy alternative fulfills stakeholder criteria?

E. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This thesis provides background on the DoD's effort to reengineer the personal property program, identifies the dominant stakeholders of this effort, develops a single set of stakeholder criteria, and evaluates the alternate proposals with respect to these criteria.

This effort employs the basic tools of evaluation research. Specifically, the design involves collecting individual opinions and archival data using primary and secondary sources on three alternate proposals to reengineer the personal property program. The archival data include the study of government and industry documents. Using this documentation, a single set of criteria is developed to evaluate the policy alternatives.

A stakeholder map is developed to identify dominant stakeholders. Individuals within each dominant stakeholder group are chosen using a convenience sample and interviewed using a telephonic questionnaire. The collected data are coded and introduced into a spreadsheet. Measures of central tendency are calculated for each criterion. Based on the value stakeholders' place on the criteria, one proposal is identified that is the best fit for each stakeholder group's expectations. Furthermore, one proposal is identified that is the best fit for all major stakeholders.

F. LIMITATIONS

Recommendations are limited to the current pilot projects. Stakeholder expectations are determined in terms of the pilot projects. There are additional stakeholder criteria but since they were not incorporated into the policy alternatives, they were not included in this study. This study focuses on determining which policy alternative(s) best reflect the stakeholders' concerns and meets their needs. This study does not attempt to address problem definition nor implementation issues.

G. ORGANIZATION OF STUDY

Chapter I, *Introduction*, presents the focus of this study. This chapter introduces the effort to reengineer DoD's personal property program, describes the pilot projects and outlines DoD's policy evaluation process. Furthermore, this chapter establishes the research question and methodology, and presents an outline of the thesis.

Chapter II, *Literature Review*, provides a definition and an overview of policy analysis in the public sector. An analysis process is also identified and reviewed. This chapter will provide an overview of the stakeholder concept. A method for conducting a stakeholder audit is described.

Chapter III, *Methodology*, articulates the research methodology used to conduct this study. A goals and evaluation criteria map is presented. The extent to which each pilot project fulfills specified criteria is determined. Finally, a stakeholder analysis is conducted.

Chapter IV, *Data*, presents summary statements and data garnered from the telephonic interviews. Measures of central tendency are developed for each stakeholder group based on the evaluation criteria.

Chapter V, *Analysis*, discusses and analyzes the data collected in the telephonic interviews.

Chapter VI, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, provides conclusions that can be drawn from an analysis of the data. Specifically, this chapter will recommend the policy alternative(s) that best fulfills stakeholder expectations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. INTRODUCTION

Public policy analysis or evaluation determines which alternative public policies will optimize on a given set of goals (Nagel, 1990, p. ix). Related concepts include policy studies, program evaluation, public management science, and policy science. Policy evaluation and analysis emphasizes examining alternative public policies, as contrasted to describing them or explaining why they exist (Nagel, p. x). This chapter provides an overview of public policy analysis in the public sector, introduces a model for performing policy analysis, and demonstrates how this model can be applied to the research question.

B. POLICY ANALYSIS IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Public policy analysis is a systematic approach to making policy choices in the public sector (Walker and Fisher, 1994, p. 1). Its purpose is to *assist* policymakers in choosing a preferred course of action amid multiple complex alternatives. The policy analysis process gathers and presents the information that assists the policymaker in making a decision between policy alternatives.

Much of the growing literature in the area of public policy addresses various approaches to policy analysis. Weimer and Vining identify three approaches: (1) the objective model, (2) the client advocate model, and (3) the issue advocate model (Weimer and Vining, 1991, p. 18). This is similar to the approaches described by Fischer, Frank and Forester: (1) the science model, (2)

the counsel model, and (3) the advocate model (Fischer, Frank, and Forester, 1987, p. 138).

The objective or science model limits the analyst to questions that science can properly answer; that is, to questions of empirical fact and practical means (Fischer, Frank, and Forester, p. 137). The client advocate or counsel model focuses on policies that provide the greatest benefit to their client. Finally, many authors endorse the issue advocate model. This approach promotes policies that achieve the greatest good for society as a whole. In general, the analyst need not adopt any one of the approaches in its extreme form. Rather than selecting one of the three fundamental approaches, the analyst should attempt to keep all three under consideration (Weimer and Vining, p. 19).

There are several alternative ways to analyze policy options. They all contain similarities, but each uses different key words to describe a particular framework and each goes into varying degrees of detail (Bonser, McGregor, and Oster, 1996, p. 48). The policy evaluation process generally involves performing the same set of logical steps, not always in the same order. Walker and Fisher present the following model as seen in Figure 3. This model is very similar to the process laid out by Stokey and Zeckhouser, Mason and Mitroff, and by Bonser, McGregor and Oster.




Figure 3. Generic Policy Evaluation Model

C. MODEL FOR EVALUATING POLICY ALTERNATIVES

The framework shown in Figure 4 is a hybrid drawn from several approaches. The available literature provides the basic components of this model. However, this model places a different emphasis on some steps and integrates other steps to provide a rational and logical basis for evaluating this case.




Figure 4. Proposed Policy Evaluation Model

1. State the Problem

The first step sets the boundaries and the context of the problem to be studied. It involves identifying the questions or issues involved, and the desired end state or goals. Proposals for policy changes generally arise out of the dissatisfaction of one or more groups of stakeholders with the efficiency or effectiveness of existing policies or programs (Rossi and Freeman, 1989, p. 73). Understanding the problem involves investigating the symptoms that prompt stakeholder dissatisfaction (Weimer and Vining, p. 212). An especially critical consideration in the explication of the problem is identifying the gap between the current policy or program outputs and outcomes and the desired output and outcomes.

Program planning is predicated on a need to reduce the gap between the desired state of affairs and what actually exists--in other words between a goal and reality (Rossi and Freeman, p. 121). Goals are generally abstract idealized statements of outcomes (Rossi and Freeman, p. 121). Policy evaluation is often complicated by the existence of multiple goals that are not clearly defined. Many programs, especially those with a large target population or far-reaching effects, initially state their goals in broad and often vague terms. Stakeholders with varying and sometimes conflicting needs, interests, and perspectives define the goals of a program.

2. Identify Solutions

This step identifies alternative policies that provide concrete steps to solve the stated problem. The majority of literature focuses on developing alternative solutions. These authors provide a sequence of activities that identify, design, and screen possible policy alternatives. However, as Weimer and Vining point out existing policy proposals often exist. "There are really four sources for developing policy alternatives: (1) existing policy proposals; (2) generic policy solutions; (3) "modified" generic policy solutions; and (4) custom-made solutions (Weimer and Vining, p. 225)." The policy analyst must be careful to avoid starting with a preconceived idea of the preferred alternatives even when evaluating existing policy proposals (Bonser, McGregor, and Oster, p. 49).

Moreover, the policy alternatives should be mutually exclusive. "You should ensure that your alternatives are mutually exclusive; they are, after all, alternative policies (Weimer and Vining, p. 227)." Alternatives are obviously not mutually exclusive if their focus or objectives are similar. In such circumstances, these policies may not provide distinct choices, and should be combined or eliminated.

3. Develop Evaluation Criteria

For a worthwhile evaluation to be undertaken, goal statements must be refined and stated in terms that can be measured, that is, operationally defined (Rossi and Freeman, p. 121). "For evaluation purposes, goal setting must lead to the operationalization of the desired outcome; that is the condition to be dealt with must be specified in detail, together with one or more criteria (Freeman and Rossi, p. 121)." Criteria are required to evaluate the extent to which each alternative policy solves the stated problem.

This step is especially difficult when diverse groups have agreed on broad goals but cannot agree on the objectives or sub-goals that support those goals. In this step the analyst must decide on the criteria with which to evaluate alternative policies (Walker and Fisher, p. 2). "Loosely speaking, a policy is a set of actions taken to solve a problem (Walker and Fisher, p. 2)." The policymaker has certain criteria that, if met, would "solve" the problem.

Identifying these criteria is a critical step in evaluating competing policies. When multiple competing stakeholders are present, it is necessary to create a single set of measurement criteria by which alternative policies may be compared. Therefore, establishing criteria requires either assumptions or knowledge about two fundamental aspects of the situation: policy goals and stakeholder values. Policy goals incorporate the set of actions that represent a solution to the problem. Stakeholder values provide a means to evaluate the policy alternatives from the perspective of each stakeholder.

4. Evaluate Solutions Based on Criteria

In this step, the alternative policies are analyzed and compared according to established criteria. "When the analysis of several alternatives has been completed, the policy analyst begins to synthesize the results (Bonser, McGregor, and Oster, p. 50)." Each alternative must be ranked according to the criteria chosen by the analyst in order to determine the alternative that is most likely to fulfill the criteria (Bonser, McGregor, and Oster, p. 50).

5. Recommend the Preferred Alternative

Finally, the evaluator should recommend the preferred alternative. "Choosing the best alternative is trivial when you have an alternative that ranks highest on all criteria (Weimer and Vining, p. 234)." Unfortunately, this rarely occurs. Rarely is the best policy also the preferred policy. "Although you may sometimes be pleasantly surprised, you should expect to find different alternatives

doing best on different criteria (Weimer and Vining, p. 234).” When alternative policies fulfill the established criteria, but to differing degrees, the analyst must make a determination as to which criteria should be given greater weight. This determination is often subjective and based on the evaluator’s approach or perspective. In this situation there are implicit trade-offs between criteria. The evaluator must be explicit in stating the values and trade-offs that were made in determining the preferred alternative.

D. APPLICATION OF MODEL TO STUDY

The policy evaluation model developed in Figure 4 is used in this study to determine which policy alternative for reengineering DoD’s personal property program best satisfies stakeholder criteria. Figure 5 identifies the steps in the model and the supporting tasks. Figure 5 also provides an overview of each step in terms of the chapter location, the corresponding figures, the responsible party, and the procedure used.

| Methodology Overview | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|------------|---|
| What? | Where? | Figure? | Performs? | Method? |
| 1. State the problem | Chapter I & II | | DoD | Literature Review |
| 2. Identify solutions | Chapter I | | DoD | Literature Review |
| 3. Develop evaluation criteria | Chapter III | | Researcher | |
| a. Identify goals | | Figure 7 | | Literature Review |
| b. Establish evaluation criteria | | Figures 8 & 9 | | Forward Mapping Process |
| c. Assess policy alternatives | | Figure 10 | | Scale used to rate criteria for each pilot project |
| d. Conduct stakeholder analysis | | | | |
| (1) Identification of stakeholders | | Figure 11 | | Constructed stakeholder map |
| (2) Determining stakeholder values | | | | |
| (a) Develop a questionnaire | | Appendix B | | Used single format for all interviews |
| (b) Choose a sample | | | | Convenience sample |
| (c) Conduct interviews of sample | | | | Telephonic interviews conducted; scale used to determine stakeholder values for criteria |
| (d) Classify results | | Appendix C | | Collected data coded into spreadsheet |
| (e) Validate results | | | | Archival Research |
| 4. Evaluate solutions based on criteria | | | Researcher | |
| a. Present Data | Chapter IV | | | Data presented at goal & sub-goal level |
| b. Data Analysis | Chapter V | Figure 12, Appendix D | | Absolute value of differences between stakeholders' and policy alternatives' values is calculated |
| 5. Recommend a preferred solution | Chapter VI | | Researcher | |

Figure 5. Methodology Overview

1. Identify Problem

Within the context of the personal property program, there has been no single and certain definition of program characteristics requiring change. While senior government officials have repeatedly identified shortcomings in the current program, criticism has focused on negative outcomes, not on specific outputs of

the program.³ In GAO/NSIAD reports 90-50 (1990) and 94-26 (1993), GAO recommended that MTMC replace or modify the domestic household goods bidding system and that DoD adopt commercial practices, such as using a smaller number of carriers. These problems, a high rate of claims, and general customer dissatisfaction with the move process have formed the basis of DoD efforts to reengineer the personal property program. This study will not attempt to identify specific issues or problems inherent in the personal property program.

2. Identify Solutions

As previously noted, there are three separate alternative solutions to the problems inherent to the personal property program. These policies do not necessarily represent the best set of alternatives, but other analysts have found them to be plausible responses to the policy problems. Furthermore, the alternatives are mutually exclusive and have a sufficiently different focus. In this study, research and subsequent analysis will focus on these existing policy proposals.

3. Develop Criteria

Establishing criteria requires either assumptions or knowledge about the situation: policy goals and stakeholder values. Numerous government and industry documents provide an initial list of the goals of the various alternatives.

³ Note the previously cited comments of the Secretary of Defense and the congressional testimonies of Mr. Roger Kallock, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics), Lieutenant Generals Thompson and Coburn, and Mr. David Warren, Director of Defense Management Issues, GAO.

However, it is necessary to determine how each alternative attempts to solve the stated problem. In other words, it is necessary to link the goals of the personal property reengineering program to the sub-goals and criteria of each alternative. This schematic or map allows the evaluator to develop a set of criteria that can be used to evaluate the extent to which each policy alternative meets a specific criterion. Chapter III, Methodology, details the criteria development process.

4. Evaluate Policy Alternatives

Once the evaluation criteria are established, the analyst must determine the value to be placed on each criterion when evaluating and comparing policy alternatives. Value is based on perspective. In this study, the perspective of each dominant stakeholder group is assessed. Chapter III, Methodology, describes the steps in this assessment. Chapter IV, Data, summarizes the values stakeholders place on the goals, sub-goals and evaluation criteria. Chapter V, Data Analysis, uses the evaluation criteria and interview results to evaluate each policy alternative from the stakeholders' perspectives.

5. Recommend Preferred Alternative

The policy analysis process deals with complex problems and, most importantly, multiple goals. It is unlikely that any policy is going to be ideal in terms of all goals. However, by establishing a single set of evaluation criteria and determining the value that dominant stakeholders place on those criteria, it is possible to recommend a preferred alternative from a particular perspective. More

importantly, it is possible to establish a set of evaluation criteria based on the aggregate values of stakeholders. Chapter VI, Conclusions and Recommendations, identifies the policy that is optimal for each stakeholder group as well an alternative that is in the best interests of all.

E. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Policy analysis “is not a specific methodology, but it makes use of a variety of methodologies in the context of a generic framework (Walker and Fisher, p. 1).” It often proves difficult to establish the boundaries and context of the problems when evaluating policies in the public sector. Multiple competing stakeholders often have varying and conflicting interests and perspectives on the goals and measurement criteria of public programs. A spectrum of approaches to discerning evaluation criteria exist. A framework for policy analysis is established based on the basic components of several models and approaches. This framework provides a method for choosing a preferred course of action amid multiple complex alternatives

III. METHODOLOGY

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the methodology used to conduct this study. The highlighted portions of Figure 6 show the steps and supporting task that are covered in this chapter. It describes the selected research focus, the primary research methods, and the steps in the evaluation criteria development process outlined in Chapter II. Furthermore, this chapter furnishes a detailed description of how the goal and evaluation criteria mapping process is used to develop a single set of criteria. An assessment of the extent to which the policy alternatives meet the criteria is provided. The chapter concludes with an outline of the stakeholder analysis process and how the evaluation criteria development process is linked to the data collection and analysis stages of the study.

B. RESEARCH FOCUS

The objective of this thesis is to determine which policy alternative for reengineering the DoD's personal property program best satisfies stakeholder criteria. The researcher chose to focus on efforts to reengineer the personal property program due to the subjective nature of this effort's goals, the existence of multiple competing stakeholders, and the potential impact of an implemented policy on servicemembers. DoD efforts to achieve significant change in the personal property program have been hampered by a lack of consensus among

stakeholders as to the problems with the program and possible solutions to those problems.

| Methodology Overview | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|------------|---|
| What? | Where? | Figure? | Performs? | Method? |
| 1. State the problem | Chapter I & II | | DoD | Literature Review |
| 2. Identify solutions | Chapter I | | DoD | Literature Review |
| 3. Develop evaluation criteria | Chapter III | | Researcher | |
| a. Identify goals | Section C | Figure 6 | | Literature Review |
| b. Establish evaluation criteria | Section D | Figures 7 & 8 | | Forward Mapping Process |
| c. Assess policy alternatives | Section E | Figure 9 | | Scale used to rate criteria for each pilot project |
| d. Conduct stakeholder analysis | Section F | | | |
| (1) Identification of stakeholders | | Figure 10 | | Constructed stakeholder map |
| (2) Determining stakeholder values | | | | |
| (a) Develop a questionnaire | | Appendix B | | Used single format for all interviews |
| (b) Choose a sample | | | | Convenience sample |
| (c) Conduct interviews of sample | | | | Telephonic interviews conducted; scale used to determine stakeholder values for criteria |
| (d) Classify results | | Appendix C | | Collected data coded into spreadsheet |
| (e) Validate results | | | | Archival Research |
| 4. Evaluate solutions based on criteria | | | Researcher | |
| a. Present Data | Chapter IV | | | Data presented at goal & sub-goal level |
| b. Data Analysis | Chapter V | Appendix D | | Absolute value of differences between stakeholders' and policy alternatives' values is calculated |
| 5. Recommend a preferred solution | Chapter VI | | Researcher | |

Figure 6. Overview of Chapter III

Each stakeholder has identified their own set of priorities and goals for any alternative to the current personal property program. DoD has attempted to represent their own interests as well as the interests of the servicemember in

crafting policy alternatives. Industry has exercised its political and market influence in a bid to ensure that their goals and criteria are incorporated into the policy that is finally implemented. This trichotomy of stakes has created a need to evaluate the various policy alternatives from the perspectives of each dominant stakeholder group as well as in aggregate.

Relevant research and analysis provides a framework to define a single set of criteria that can be used to evaluate the current personal property program policy alternatives from the various stakeholders' perspectives. This effort employs the basic tools of evaluation research. The design involves collecting individual opinions and archival data using primary and secondary sources on three alternate proposals to reengineer the personal property program. The process of developing evaluation criteria used in this thesis is broken down into four iterative steps:

1. Identify goals of the personal property program reengineering effort
2. Establish evaluation criteria
3. Assess three policy alternatives developed by DoD for reengineering DoD's Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program
4. Conduct stakeholder analysis and calculate the values each stakeholder group places on evaluation criteria.

C. IDENTIFY GOALS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY PROGRAM REENGINEERING EFFORT

As a result of the initial joint DoD/industry working group session, DoD and industry agreed to ten goals for the reengineered personal property program (GAO/NSIAD-97-49, p. 3). In addition to these goals, government, industry and

government contractors have also stated or published goals for reengineering the program.⁴ Figure 7 summarizes these goals. Although these goals are easily understood, they are too vague to lead to agreement that they either have or have not been met. Any assessment of the extent to which each proposal meets the goals is necessarily limited by the lack of precise definitions of each goal and the way to achieve it (GAO/NSIAD-97-49, p. 3). "Moreover, the [government and industry program] proposals were written in such a way that did not specifically address how each would achieve the stated goals (GAO/NSIAD-97-49, p. 3)."

In order to discriminate the goals of the three pilots or proposed policy alternatives, it is necessary to determine which organization or group has the ability to ensure its goals were sustained by the alternate policies. Government policy development is not only analytically complex but also intensely political, involving many powerful interests and convictions that will attempt to influence the goals of any effort to change policy (Bonser, McGregor, and Oster, p. 18). DoD initially developed three pilot projects that emphasized their goals for a future personal property program. After numerous debates, industry protests and GAO reports, DoD received Congressional approval to conduct its pilots projects.

⁴ Primary sources include speeches by public officials, government and industry congressional testimony, GAO reports, and internal documents and memoranda of the DoD.

| DoD/Industry Working Group | Logistics Management Institute Reports | Industry | Army | CINC, USTRANSCOM | Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics) |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Quality service | Quality service | Compete equally and fairly | Improve Quality of Life | Improve Quality of Life | Improve Service |
| Improve on-time pickup | Reasonable cost | Maintain aspects of current system | Customer satisfaction | Reduce Cost | Simplify the process |
| Improve on-time delivery | Permits appropriate levels of control | Provide for small business | Lower claims settlement time | Minimize impact on small business | Reduce infrastructure |
| Customer satisfaction | Common commercial practices | | Increase percentage of direct deliveries | Implement process improvement innovations | |
| Corporate business practices | Partnerships with industry | | Minimize impact on small business | | |
| Lower loss /damage, claims | Simplified procedures | | Reduce Cost | | |
| Simplify system | Accommodates industry structure | | | | |
| Ensure capacity | Provides enhanced business opportunities | | | | |
| Provide opportunity for small business | | | | | |
| Provide best value | | | | | |

Figure 7. Goals for Reengineering Personal Property Program

However, even with congressional approval, DoD still found it necessary to recognize the needs of industry. As a result, the various DoD and industry goals must be synthesized into concepts or general goals that recognize industry's concerns as well as fulfill DoD's primary goals to improve quality of life. Three

general goals were identified: 1) improve servicemember's quality of life, 2) reduce the total cost of the personal property program, and 3) maintain a competitive market and limit the impact of a policy change on small businesses. These goals formed the basis of the forward mapping process to be detailed later.

D. ESTABLISH EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation criteria must be able to measure the extent to which the goals or concepts of a policy are achieved. "A good criterion provides a basis for measuring progress toward achieving a goal (Weimer and Vining, p. 223)." However, not every goal can be reasonably quantified by a single objective or criterion. "Rather than emphasize a single objective that only measures one dimension of a goal, you should try to specify criteria that cover all the important dimensions (Weimer and Vining, p. 223)." As Weimer and Vining point out, multiple criteria may be used to measure the extent to which a policy's goals are achieved. "The set of criteria should capture all the important dimensions of the relevant goals (Weimer and Vining, p. 225)."

The evaluator must be able to systematically link the goals of the policy with the supporting sub-goals and criteria. There are a number of methods that can be used to establish the relationship between goals and criteria. One such method is labeled, "forward mapping (Bryson, 1995, p. 287)." Through the use of forward mapping and similar techniques the evaluator is able to develop a map linking the program's goals with its supporting sub-goals and criteria. The

forward mapping process begins with a program's goals, with as clear a statement as possible of the policy maker's intent, and proceeds through a sequence of increasingly more specific steps to define performance measures (Bryson, p.287). At the bottom of the process, one states, again with as much precision as possible, the criteria to be used, measured in terms of the ordinal statement of intent (Bryson, p. 287). The end result of this effort is the development of a map that defines the policy's goals and the characteristics that support achieving those goals.

Three general goals are defined that embody the intent of the reengineering effort. These goals are improve quality of life, reduce total cost, and reduce the impact on small business. Sub-goals are identified that support the attainment of these general goals. Criteria are established based on these sub-goals. The evaluation criteria must be able to measure the extent to which each pilot project manifests the goals and corresponding sub-goals. Therefore, each pilot must be assessed in order to determine if the criteria are adequate and are representative of the scope of the pilot projects. There is no attempt to identify criteria beyond the scope of these three alternative policies. The mapping process is useful in reducing the complexity of the goals and sub-goals to the point that the performance measures or criteria are evident. Evaluation criteria are established at the lowest level of indenture. The results of the "forward mapping" process are summarized in Figure 6.

The adequacy of the criteria is verified using two common research methods. The first is the collection of data through unobtrusive measures, specifically archival research, and the second is the collection and verification of data through electronic correspondence.

Primary sources are used in this study to identify the goals and sub-goals of each policy alternative. Primary sources include speeches, congressional testimony, reports, and documents issued by various U.S. government agencies. Examples include reports by the General Accounting Office, inter-agency information papers, briefs and memoranda, and contractual statements of work. Secondary sources are used to clarify specific aspects and characteristics of the program. For example, the terms "best value" and "commercial business practices" were used indiscriminately. As a result, it was necessary to define the limits of each as it related to the pilot projects.

Data collected from archival sources served as a basis for the questions asked through electronic correspondence. Data were requested via electronic mail to verify the accuracy of the information gained from primary or secondary sources. Data were collected from a limited group of individuals having expert knowledge of the subject area due to their position or experience. Correspondence also provided additional information that was not gathered from archival resources. This information provided insight into known goals and sub-goals and highlighted unknown features of each pilot.

- I. **Improve Quality of Life.** This goal is based on achieving customer satisfaction and improving or expanding services to the customer.
- A. Use of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)-based contracting method
 - B. Loss and Damage Claim
 - 1. **Full Replacement**
 - 2. **Direct Settlement with:**
 - a. 3rd Party
 - b. Transportation provider
 - c. Government
 - 3. **Reduced claim preparation requirements**
 - 4. **Reduced claim settlement period**
 - C. Provider Qualification - Standards for contract award
 - 1. **Financial stability** - providers have strong financial credentials, low risk of contractor failure
 - 2. **Ensured capacity** - proven track records and capability proportionate to the shipper's requirements.
 - 3. **Past Performance** - imposition of stringent performance standards
 - On-time pick-up and delivery rates
 - Loss and damage rates comparable to or better than the lowest commercial account's loss and damage rates
 - Customer feedback (intangibles) - i.e., professional crews, comfort with provider
 - 4. **Inclusion of Service Contract Act** - this Act requires the Providers to pay employees the prevailing minimum wage for the area in which they are working
 - 5. **Inconvenience payments** - provider pays servicemember in the event that the provider is unable to deliver personal property when scheduled
 - D. Provider Performance Measurement - Relationship with providers contingent on them meeting and maintaining performance standards
 - Use of customer surveys**
 - Random inspections**
 - Periodic performance assessment**
 - E. Move Management
 - 1. **Pre-move counseling**
 - 2. **Single point of contact move management**
 - 3. **Binding estimates for excess costs**
 - 4. **Destination Information**
 - 5. **Shipment tracking**
 - 6. **Delivery coordination**
 - 7. **Real Estate assistance**

Figure 8. Goals and Evaluation Criteria

- II. **Reduce Total Cost.** This concept includes direct (transportation, storage, accessories) and indirect cost. The indirect baseline cost includes management of the personal property program, personal property services provided, quality assurance, financial transaction processing, and additional systems operations and maintenance cost. This concept is based on reducing the government's administrative burden through eliminating or improving current processes or implementing better business practices.
- A. Pricing Strategy -Improve rate solicitation process and adopt commercial or standard rate structure
 - 1. **Continued use of DoD rate solicitations**, domestic and international
 - 2. **Adoption of commercial tariff**, domestic
 - 3. **GSA Tender 1-W**, domestic and international
 - 4. **Single-Factor-Rate (SFR)**, domestic and international
 - 5. **Commissions** - paid to move managers by transportation providers
 - B. Traffic Allocation - Allocation of traffic to and amongst providers
 - 1. **Contract consolidation** - consolidation of 2 or more procurement requirements for goods or services previously provided or performed under separate small contracts into a solicitation of offers for a single contract
 - 2. **Traffic distribution based on quality**
 - 3. **Traffic distribution performed by:**
 - a. 3rd Party
 - b. Servicemember
 - c. Government
 - 4. **Reduction or elimination of current use of the Traffic Distribution Record (TDR)**
 - 5. **Fewer contracts awarded**
 - 6. **Longer contract periods**
 - C. EDI Strategy: EDI capability or a willingness to do business in an EDI environment
 - D. Reduction in the complexity of the Movement Category and Service Structure
- III. **Reduce Impact on Small Business.** This concept will be measured against the Small Business Act, Public Law 85-536, as amended, which states that the government-wide goal for participation by small business concerns shall be established at not less than 23 percent revenue. Small business is defined for purposes of this evaluation plan as those businesses with annual average gross revenue of \$18.5 million or less (prime contractor or Provider). This concept strives to **develop and maintain a competitive market.**
- A. Traffic Structure: combines traffic flow and traffic scope-focus on streamlining existing network based on outbound traffic lanes from an area of responsibility (AOR) to a rate area (RA)
 - B. Payment
 - 1. **Defense Finance & Accounting Service (DFAS)**
 - 2. **Bank Service Contract**
 - 3. **Government Credit Card: IMPAC**
 - C. SBA Compliance Means
 - 1. **Application of Small Business Act**
 - 2. **Small Business Set Asides as Primes**

Figure 8. Goals and Evaluation Criteria (cont.)

The use of archival sources and electronic correspondence has certain limitations. First, archives may contain errors, be incomplete or be no longer relevant. Secondly, the source may present only one perspective. Finally, different meanings may be assigned to similar terms or concepts based on the archival source or respondent. These problems were mitigated by using up to date multiple sources. Multiple sources from different levels and components of DoD and government were reviewed. Furthermore, archival sources and electronic responses were cross-referenced. For example, congressional testimonies were checked for consistency with GAO reports. Also, electronic responses were used to verify accuracy and relevancy of internal memoranda, statements of work, and performance work statements.

E. ASSESS POLICY ALTERNATIVES

This step determines the extent to which each policy alternative fulfills the established criteria. The results of the forward mapping process summarized in Figure 8 were used to develop criteria by which to assess the policy alternatives. There are two steps in this process. The first step is the identification of general goals and the specification of sub-goals. In the second step, criteria were developed to measure the extent to which the goals and sub-goals are achieved. Additionally, the policy alternatives were compared and appraised at the criteria and sub-criteria level where data were available.

Thus, the forward mapping process creates a strong relationship between the goals, supporting sub-goals and the evaluation criteria. For example, in Figure 9, there are five ways to improve quality of life for the servicemember: A) contracting method, B) loss and damage claims, C) provider qualifications, D) provider performance measurement, and E) move management. There are three criteria for measuring the extent to which provider performance measures have been established: 1) customer surveys, 2) random inspections, and 3) periodic performance measurement.

Once the goals and criteria were identified and their relationship to each other was established, I created a scale to measure the extent to which each policy alternative embodied the evaluation criteria. The following scale was used to rate how important the criteria were to the pilot project:

- 1 = Not important
- 2 = Little importance
- 3 = Medium importance
- 4 = High importance
- 5 = Critical

Using this scale, I independently rated each pilot project with respect to the criteria. I made a judgment as to the value each policy alternative places on a criterion. The pilot project characteristics displayed in Figure 2 formed the basis of this assessment. Statements of work and performance work statements were also used to provide details on specific aspects of each pilot.

| Goal | Sub-goal | Criteria | Sub-criteria |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| I. Improve Quality of Life | A. Contracting Method | FAR -based | |
| | B. Loss and Damage Claim | 1. Full Replacement | |
| | | 2. Direct Claim Settlement: | a. Move Manager b. Transportation Provider c. Government |
| | | 3. Reduced claim preparation requirements | |
| | | 4. Reduced claim settlement period | |
| | C. Provider Qualification | 1. Financial stability | |
| | | 2. Ensured capacity | |
| | | 3. Past performance | |
| | | 4. Inclusion of Service Contract Act | |
| | | 5. Inconvenience payments | |
| | D. Provider Performance Measurement | 1. Customer Surveys | |
| | | 2. Random Inspections | |
| | | 3. Periodic Performance Assessment | |
| | E. Move Management | 1. Pre-move counseling | |
| | | 2. Single point of contact move management | |
| | | 3. Binding estimates for excess costs | |
| | | 4. Destination information | |
| | | 5. Shipment tracking | |
| | | 6. Delivery coordination | |
| | | 7. Real Estate assistance | |
| II. Reduce Total Cost | A. Pricing Strategy | 1. Continued use of DoD solicitations | Domestic International |
| | | 2. Commercial Tariff | Domestic |
| | | 3. GSA Tender 1-W | Domestic International |
| | | 4. Single-Factor-Rate | Domestic International |
| | | 5. Commissions for move manager | |
| | B. Traffic Allocation | 1. Contract consolidation | |
| | | 2. Traffic distribution based on quality | |
| | | 3. Traffic distribution performed by: | a. Move Manager b. Servicemember c. Government |
| | | 4. Reduction or Elimination of Traffic Distribution Record | |
| | | 5. Reduction in Contracts awarded | |
| | | 6. Increase length of Contract award | |
| | C. EDI capability required | | |
| | D. Service Structure | Reduction in movement and storage categories | |
| III. Limit Impact on Small Business; Maintain a Competitive Market | A. Traffic Structure | Change current structure of AOR to RA | |
| | B. Payment | 1. DFAS | |
| | | 2. Bank Service Contract | |
| | | 3. Government Credit Card | |
| | C. SBA Compliance Means | 1. Application of Small Business Act 2. Small Business prime contractor set asides | |

Figure 9. Goals and Evaluation Criteria

Figure 10 lists the values assigned for each criterion relative to the pilot projects. These values represent how important each criterion is to a particular policy alternative. For example, the SAM pilot places medium importance on the use of FAR-based contracts. On the other hand, FAR-based contracts are highly important in the FSMP and critical to the MTMC pilot.

Interaction through electronic correspondence with the project officers for each pilot project biased this assessment somewhat. Certain project officers were better able to articulate the characteristics and benefits of their pilot. In an attempt to reduce this bias, I limited my interaction with the project officers. This step is performed prior to determining stakeholder values in order to prevent stakeholder comments from further biasing this study.

The lack of inter-rater reliability also creates a bias in this assessment. Only one rater was available to conduct the assessment of the policy alternatives. This limitation is a result of the complex nature of the personal property program and the reengineering effort. In order to rate the pilots, a level of knowledge and familiarity with the program is required. The use of multiple raters in follow-on research will provide a greater degree of accuracy and reliability to this assessment.

| Sub-goals | Evaluation Criteria | | Pilots | | |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------|------|------|
| | | | SAM | FSMP | MTMC |
| Contracting Method | FAR -based | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | Full Replacement | | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| | Direct Claim Settlement | Move Manager | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | Transportation Provider | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| | | Government | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | Reduced claim preparation requirements | | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| | Reduced claim settlement period | | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| Provider Qualification | Financial stability | | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| | Ensured capacity | | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| | Past performance | | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| | Inclusion of Service Contract Act | | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | Inconvenience payments | | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Provider Performance Measurement | Customer Surveys | | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| | Random Inspections | | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Periodic Performance Assessment | | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Move Management | Pre-move counseling | | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| | Single point of contact move management | | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | Binding estimates for excess costs | | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| | Destination information | | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | Shipment tracking | | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| | Delivery coordination | | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| | Real Estate assistance | | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | Pricing Strategy | Continued use of DoD solicitations | Domestic | 1 | 1 |
| International | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Commercial Tariff | | Domestic | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| GSA Tender 1-W | | Domestic | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | International | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Single-Factor-Rate | | Domestic | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | International | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| Commissions for move manager | | 1 | 3 | 1 | |
| Traffic Allocation | Contract consolidation | | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| | Traffic distribution based on quality | | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| | Traffic distribution performed by: | Move Manager | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | Servicemember | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | | Government | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| | Reduction or Elimination of Traffic Distribution Record | | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| | Reduction in Contracts awarded | | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| | Increase length of Contract award | | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| EDI capability required | | 1 | 3 | 5 | |
| Service Structure | Reduction in movement and storage categories | | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Traffic Structure | Change current structure of AOR to RA | | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Payment | DFAS | | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| | Bank Service Contract | | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | Government Credit Card | | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| SBA Compliance Means | Application of Small Business Act | | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| | Small Business prime contractor set asides | | 5 | 1 | 1 |

Figure 10. Value of Criteria for Each Pilot Project

F. STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS PROCESS

Once the evaluation criteria are determined, the evaluator must establish the value to be placed on each criterion. Attempts to introduce policy analysis into most arenas of public policy inevitably founder on evident disagreements over both the measurement techniques and value criteria (Fischer and Forester, p.232). In undertaking their work, evaluators usually find themselves confronted with individuals and groups who hold competing and sometimes combative views on the policy alternatives and whose interests will be affected by the outcome (Rossi and Freeman, p.422). These individuals and groups often place vastly different values on evaluation criteria. Smith points out that "it is rare to find consensus about what constitutes the objectives of a public sector program (Smith, 1996, p.9)."

In order to establish whether consensus exists or, when no consensus exists, the relative weight or value to assign each criterion, the evaluator must perform a stakeholder analysis. The identification of key stakeholders and the determination of a set of stakeholder criteria are critical to choosing a preferred alternative from amongst complex policy options. "If an organization does not know who its stakeholders are, what criteria they use to judge the organization, and how the organization is performing against those criteria, there is little likelihood that the organization will know what it should do to satisfy its key stakeholders (Bryson, p. 70)." The stakeholder analysis process is broken down into two stages for the

purposes of this study: 1) identifying the stakeholders and 2) determining the value they place on each objective.

1. Identification of Stakeholders

The first step in a stakeholder analysis is to identify an organization's stakeholders. This step usually begins with the construction of a stakeholder map (Roberts and King, 1989, p. 65). Mitroff defines stakeholders as "all those parties who either affect or are affected by an organization's actions, behavior, and policies (Mitroff, 1983, p. 4)." This definition is very similar to the definition used by Freeman. Freeman defines stakeholders as "any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives (Freeman, 1984, p. 39)." Both definitions convey essentially the same meaning and are used interchangeably in this study.

The purpose of the stakeholder map is to identify the stakeholders in the reengineering of the personal property program. An initial stakeholder map must not leave out any group or individual that can affect or is affected by an organization's policies (Freeman, p. 52). Roberts and King recommend reducing the number of stakeholders by categorizing them into larger, more general groups (Roberts and King, p. 69). Once identified, individual stakeholders are grouped according to similar stakes and organized into an overall "stakeholder map" (Roberts and King, p.69).

Three stakeholder groups relevant to reengineering the personal property program were identified. Figure 11 contains a list of the dominant stakeholder groups. These groups are 1) government, 2) industry, and 3) servicemembers. Industry is broken down further into two sub-groups: relocation management and transportation providers.




Figure 11. Stakeholder Map

a. Government Stakeholders

The United States Government is responsible for initiating and funding the program as well as for deciding which policy alternative is instituted. There are numerous stakeholders within the government. The primary stakeholder is the Department of Defense. Agencies and components of DoD are also classified as stakeholders to the reengineering effort.

b. Industry Stakeholder

Industry stakeholders are commercial organizations and groups who compete for business under the personal property program. There are two major sub-groups within the industry stakeholder group. These are 1) relocation management companies and 2) transportation providers.

(1) Relocation Managers. Relocation managers provide a wide range of relocation services through an integrated network of transportation providers, real estate agents, and move coordinators. The Military Mobility Coalition is an ad hoc organization formed in the spring of 1996 to represent the relocation management industry's interests in working with the DoD's household goods reengineering initiatives (Groover, Jr., 1999). The majority of membership consists of relocation and move management companies. The coalition currently includes twenty-seven military organizations, Business Executives for National Security, and most major real estate networks (Groover, Jr., 1999).

(2) Transportation Providers. Two organizations represent and promote the interests of the transportation and storage portions of the moving industry before federal and state legislative and regulatory bodies. These are the Household Goods Forwarders Association (HGFA), and the American Moving and Storage Association (AMSA).⁵ The members of the HGFA comprise all facets of the moving industry, including moving and storage firms, national van

⁵ The American Moving and Storage Association was formed when the American Movers Conference and the National Moving and Storage Association combined.

lines, line-haul firms, international and domestic forwarders, port agents, claims adjusters, material providers, insurance providers, technology firms, and others (Head, 1999). Members include some 1,500 international and domestic companies, the majority of which are small businesses (Head, 1999). The AMSA is a national trade association of the moving and storage industry. It has approximately 3,400 members nationwide representing the entire spectrum of the industry and including national van lines, their affiliated agents (carriers and non-carriers) and independent regional and national carriers (Harrison, 1999).

c. Servicemember

Servicemembers are the customers of the personal property program. There are over 1.4 million servicemembers in the United States Armed Forces serving in 140 countries worldwide. There are an additional 1.9 million family members. The majority of servicemembers are under the age of twenty-five years old and have served less than 10 years.

2. Determining Values Stakeholders Place on Evaluation Criteria

The second step of the stakeholder analysis is to determine how important an objective is to each stakeholder and respective stakeholder group. "Different stakeholders do not generally share the same definitions of an organization's 'problems,' and hence, they do not in general share the same 'solutions (Mitroff, p. 5).'" Therefore, an evaluator must strive to determine the value stakeholders

place on the objectives, and the associated measurement criteria, that formulate a given "solution" or policy.

Conflict over values arises because the maximization of one value inevitably is at the expense of another (Fischer and Forester, p. 232). Evaluators are often unsure whose perspective they should take in designing an evaluation (Rossi and Freeman, p. 425). As noted in Chapter II, there is no proper perspective, but rather different perspectives may be equally legitimate. The responsibility of the evaluator is not to take one of the many perspectives as *the* legitimate one, but rather to be clear from which perspectives a particular evaluation is being undertaken (Rossi and Freeman, p. 425).

In many cases the information required to complete this step is readily available from archival records. "In some cases, however, the information must be systematically gathered by interviewing individual stakeholders (Freeman, p. 114)." Archival sources provided background on the perspectives of the various stakeholder groups. However, interviews were necessary to determine the value stakeholders place on the evaluation criteria.

a. Developing a Questionnaire

Once the initial stakeholder analysis was completed, I developed a questionnaire to ascertain the value that stakeholders place on the evaluation criteria. There is no attempt to identify stakeholder objectives that fall outside the scope of the three alternative policies. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in

Appendix B. Questions were phrased in such a way as to necessitate a structured response from each interviewee. The questionnaire provides a single format by which to evaluate responses from the sample.

b. Choosing a Sample

In order to conserve time and money, a convenience sample was used. Interviewees were chosen from each stakeholder group. A total of seventeen interviews were conducted with representatives from the three stakeholder groups. Seven interviews were conducted with representatives from the government, four interviews were conducted with members of industry, and six interviews were conducted with servicemembers or servicemember representatives.

Interviews were conducted with government officials at every level of the reengineering effort beginning with USTRANSCOM and ending at the project management level. Interviews with members of industry were divided equally between transportation providers and relocation managers. All servicemembers interviewed were officers in the United States Marine Corps with six to fifteen years of active service and having moved an average of seven times. A representative of a servicemember organization was also interviewed.

c. Conducting the Interviews

Interviews were conducted telephonically. Each interviewee was told the goal of the interview. The interviewee was then asked how important they felt each criterion was to any effort to change the current personal property program. The respondents answered the questions using the following scale:

0 = Not applicable

1 = Not important

2 = Low importance

3 = Medium importance

4 = High importance

5 = Critical

Definitions for the evaluation criteria were based on the goals and criteria described in Figure 8. During the course of the interviews, respondents often provided additional comments and information beyond the scope of the question. This information was useful in developing a more thorough understanding of the issues involved in the reengineering effort and provided insight into the political dynamics of public policy evaluation and implementation. These comments are discussed in Chapter VI, Conclusions and Recommendations.

d. Classifying Results

Collected data were coded into a spreadsheet and measures of central tendency were calculated for each evaluation criterion, including arithmetic

means and standard deviations. Using the measures generated from the data, additional measures were compiled at the sub-goal and goal level for review and examination. This data is presented in Chapter IV. An analysis of the results of the statistical results is provided in Chapter V.

e. Validation

If the evaluation process is to be enhanced, the data gathered must be valid; that is, the “right” responses must be assessed, and in a manner that will elicit meaningful measurements (Levine, Berenson, and Stephan, 1998, p. 9). Interview data must be validated as far as possible to ensure the accuracy of the results. Misunderstandings may be introduced because of difficulties in establishing proper modes for communicating with different stakeholders (Rossi and Freeman, p. 425). Stakeholders define terms in different fashions and their responses are based on that definition. Questions were to provide each interviewee with same definition of each criterion. However, interviewees had different degrees of involvement and familiarity with the alternative policies and characteristics of the personal property program. In summary, although the methodology was to apply standard definitions to all the criterion, interviewees often required additional clarification beyond the standard definitions.

Another potential problem is the reliability of the results. Bryson points out that “stakeholders may not be completely honest (Bryson, p. 73).” Responses are the interviewees’ professed or espoused values, not necessarily the

true value they place on the criteria. Value is also relative amongst respondents. Although the scale was defined, my speculation is that some respondents may have inflated their values while others deflated theirs. This conclusion is based on the general comments some interviewees made with respect to the criteria. In these cases, I reminded the interviewee of the scale being used. Sometimes interviewees attempted to answer according to the program they supported and sometimes they espoused their personal opinions.

An attempt was made to mitigate potential sources of error by verifying data with archival sources. Responses were double-checked to ensure consistency with congressional testimony, published stakeholder documents and GAO reports. I also reviewed responses to identify any obvious disparate trends amongst stakeholders within a stakeholder group.

G. CHAPTER SUMMARY

The four-step method to develop evaluation criteria and establish the value stakeholders place on each criterion is an iterative process. Evaluation criteria are developed using data gathered through archival and electronic correspondence research. While many steps in the process are largely subjective, a concerted effort was made to crosscheck and verify each assumption. The result is a list of evaluation criteria and an assessment of the extent to which each pilot project meets those criteria. The value stakeholders place on each criterion is established

by conducting interviews with a convenience sample of stakeholders. This data is presented in Chapter IV.

IV. DATA

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents and discusses the data collected on the values stakeholders place on the evaluation criteria for reengineering DoD's personal property program. The data presented were gathered through telephonic interviews using a standard questionnaire. The respondents were from a convenience sample of stakeholders. A total of seventeen interviews were conducted. Every stakeholder contacted agreed to be interviewed.

B. STATISTICAL MEASURES

Interviewee responses were recorded for each evaluation criteria. The data were then entered into a spreadsheet. The arithmetic mean and the standard deviation of individual stakeholder responses were computed for each stakeholder group as well as an aggregate for all stakeholders. Summarized data reveal differences in values between stakeholders, as well as expose shared values amongst stakeholders. Interview data and statistical analysis is presented in Appendix C.

Data are presented and discussed at the goal and sub-goal level as shown in Figure 9. I integrated evaluation criteria data at the sub-goal level by calculating the mean of the group averages for the criteria that support each sub-goal. For example, the value assigned to "D) performance measurement" by each stakeholder group represents the average of the values calculated for: 1) customer

surveys, 2) random inspections, and 3) periodic performance assessment. I integrated sub-goal values at the general goal level by computing the average for the sub-goal values that support each goal. For instance, I derived the value for “(I) improve quality of life” by determining the average for the following sub-goals: A) contractor method, B) loss and damage claim, C) provider qualification, D) performance measurement and E) move management.

Statistical methods help reduce the “raw” data generated from the interview process by generating summary measures. The measures help to focus the data and reduce the variation between individual stakeholders within a stakeholder group. The use of common statistical measures simplifies the evaluation process when numerous stakeholders value multiple complex evaluation criteria differently. However, an arithmetic mean may be skewed when extremely high or low responses known as outliers are present in the data.

1. Improve the Servicemember’s Quality of Life

| Improve Quality of Life | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.68 | 0.40 |
| Government | 3.83 | 0.35 |
| Providers | 3.02 | 1.15 |
| Relocation | 4.09 | 0.57 |
| Industry | 3.56 | 0.52 |
| Servicemembers | 3.65 | 0.40 |

Of the three goals, stakeholders place the highest value on improving servicemembers quality of life. Clearly, this goal is seen as the key component in

the effort to reengineer the personal property program. Relocation providers place the highest value on this goal. Transportation providers place the lowest value on this goal. Government and servicemember stakeholders are the most consistent in placing a high value on this goal.

a. Contracting Method

| Contracting Method | | |
|---------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.03 | 0.29 |
| Government | 3.33 | 1.63 |
| Providers | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Relocation | 4.50 | 0.71 |
| Industry | 2.75 | 2.06 |
| Servicemembers | 3.00 | 2.00 |

Transportation providers are diametrically opposed to the use of FAR-based contracts in the personal property program. Government and relocation management stakeholders consistently support the use of FAR based contracts with the exception of one individual stakeholder. Servicemembers, for the most part, are not concerned with the type of contracting method.

b. Loss and Damage Claim

| Improving Loss and Damage Claim Process | | |
|--|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 4.11 | 0.82 |
| Government | 4.31 | 0.64 |
| Providers | 3.46 | 0.79 |
| Relocation | 4.42 | 1.17 |
| Industry | 3.94 | 0.97 |
| Servicemembers | 4.08 | 0.91 |

There is generally strong support amongst stakeholder groups for improving the loss and damage claim process. Providing full replacement coverage for the servicemember during the move received the highest aggregate value and can be considered critical to any effort to reengineer the personal property program. The standard deviation indicates a large variation in responses. This variation is due to the choices respondents had when considering direct claim settlement. Interviewees were asked to choose between three mutually exclusive options when settling a loss or damage claim. The majority of stakeholders prefer claims settlement with the transportation provider. A reduced claim preparation requirement and claim settlement period are both highly valued by all stakeholders.

c. Provider Qualification

| Provider Qualifications | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.69 | 0.66 |
| Government | 3.90 | 0.36 |
| Providers | 3.40 | 1.19 |
| Relocation | 3.30 | 1.40 |
| Industry | 3.35 | 1.21 |
| Servicemembers | 3.82 | 0.63 |

Creating or increasing standards for awarding contracts is valued as having medium to high importance to the stakeholders. Stakeholders also perceive ensuring industry has the capacity to meet contractual obligations and qualifying providers based on past performance as important features to the reengineering

effort. The inclusion of the Service Contract Act is seen as having very little value by industry.

d. Performance Measures

| Use of Performance Measures | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.73 | 0.34 |
| Government | 3.71 | 0.49 |
| Providers | 3.83 | 0.29 |
| Relocation | 3.67 | 1.04 |
| Industry | 3.75 | 0.50 |
| Servicemembers | 3.72 | 0.10 |

Stakeholders are fairly uniform in their feeling that there should be some form of performance measurement within the personal property program. Stakeholders value the use of customer surveys the most. However, periodic performance assessments are almost as highly valued.

e. Move Management

| Expanding Move Management Services | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.85 | 0.68 |
| Government | 3.90 | 0.95 |
| Providers | 3.43 | 1.02 |
| Relocation | 4.57 | 0.53 |
| Industry | 4.00 | 0.68 |
| Servicemembers | 3.64 | 0.80 |

This sub-goal includes the provision of expanded services to the servicemember by a move manager or transportation provider. Government and the relocation management stakeholders place the highest value on expanding

move management services. Servicemembers and transportation providers feel that as a whole these services are moderately important. A single point of contact during the move process, shipment tracking, and delivery coordination are perceived as providing the most value an aggregate of stakeholders. While real estate assistance is seen as critical to improving customer satisfaction by the relocation industry, the majority of other stakeholders place very little value on this criterion.

2. Reduce Total Cost of the Personal Property Program

| Reduce Total Cost | | |
|-------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.31 | 0.59 |
| Government | 3.47 | 0.84 |
| Providers | 3.11 | 0.45 |
| Relocation | 3.44 | 1.13 |
| Industry | 3.28 | 0.62 |
| Servicemembers | 3.18 | 0.37 |

The goal of reducing the total cost of the personal property program is moderately valued by the stakeholders. Stakeholders place the greatest value on changing the traffic allocation process and encouraging the use of electronic data interchange within the personal property program. Stakeholders have strong feelings on the type of pricing strategy used in the policy alternatives. However, most stakeholders were ambivalent about changes to the category and service structure. Servicemembers demonstrated a discernible lack of interest in efforts supporting the reduction in total cost.

a. Price Strategy

| Price Strategy | | |
|----------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 2.67 | 0.82 |
| Government | 2.66 | 0.81 |
| Providers | 2.69 | 1.03 |
| Relocation | 2.44 | 1.80 |
| Industry | 2.58 | 1.02 |
| Servicemembers | 2.76 | 0.77 |

Stakeholders are unanimous in their opposition to a continuation of the current DoD solicitation process. Moreover, servicemembers do not see pricing strategies as their concern. The majority of stakeholders support the use of a domestic commercial tariff and an international single factor rate.

Transportation providers support the use of a commercial tariff, but resist efforts to deeply discount the commercial rate. Transportation providers oppose commissions for move managers as a violation of the Anti-Kickback Act.⁶

Government stakeholders and move managers, on the other hand, believe commissions are representative of common commercial practices and should be allowed in the personal property program.

⁶ The Anti-Kickback Act defines a kickback as anything of value provided to a prime contractor for the purpose of improperly obtaining favorable treatment in connection with a government subcontract.

b. Traffic Allocation

| Traffic Allocation | | |
|--------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.59 | 0.35 |
| Government | 3.64 | 0.53 |
| Providers | 2.75 | 1.24 |
| Relocation | 4.33 | 0.80 |
| Industry | 3.54 | 0.54 |
| Servicemembers | 3.58 | 0.36 |

Stakeholders place a high value on using quality as a basis for assigning traffic to carriers. However, many stakeholders stated that traffic should not be allocated on quality alone, but should be based on "best value."⁷ Best value describes a process for allocating traffic based primary on quality, but also considers cost a factor. The transportation industry views contract consolidation and a reduction in contract awards as anti-small business. Government stakeholders and relocation managers feel these two criteria are significant ways to reduce administrative requirements and reduce costs. The majority of stakeholders support a policy in which either a move manager or the servicemember performs traffic distribution. Transportation providers are in opposition to any policy that allows move managers to choose carriers. There is a consensus amongst stakeholders on increasing the length of contract awards to at least one year.

⁷ "Carriers" include both motor carriers and freight forwarders

c. *Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Capability*

| EDI Capability | | |
|----------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.99 | |
| Government | 4.57 | |
| Providers | 3.50 | |
| Relocation | 4.50 | |
| Industry | 4.00 | |
| Servicemembers | 3.40 | |

Government and industry stakeholders place a relatively high value on encouraging the use of electronic data interchange within the personal property program. Servicemembers view EDI as moderately important to the reengineering effort. Government believes EDI is critical to achieving future cost savings. Industry stakeholders see EDI is a viable goal, but are concerned that requiring a level of EDI capability may place an excessive burden on small businesses.

d. *Reduce Complexity of Movement Category and Service Structure*

| Category & Service Structure | | |
|------------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.00 | |
| Government | 3.00 | |
| Providers | 3.50 | |
| Relocation | 2.50 | |
| Industry | 3.00 | |
| Servicemembers | 3.00 | |

Stakeholders place only a moderate value on reducing the complexity of the movement category and service structure. Relatively, most stakeholders viewed this criterion as a low priority. In consonance with this

viewpoint, the policy alternatives minimize changes to these categories and services.

3. Maintain a Competitive Market

| Maintain a Competitive Market | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.26 | 0.38 |
| Government | 3.19 | 0.36 |
| Providers | 4.03 | 0.71 |
| Relocation | 3.44 | 1.36 |
| Industry | 3.63 | 0.76 |
| Servicemembers | 2.95 | 0.43 |

Government and industry stakeholders value the contributions of small businesses to the personal property program highly. However, there are differing opinions on the role small business should play in the program. Transportation providers place a high value on limiting the impact of policy changes on small business. They have lobbied congress strongly on this point. Government stakeholders and move managers assert that current laws protect small businesses and the potential impact on small business should be only moderately valued. Servicemembers expressed very little interest in this goal.

a. Simplified and Reduced Traffic Structure

| Traffic Structure | | |
|-------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.69 | |
| Government | 3.57 | |
| Providers | 4.00 | |
| Relocation | 5.00 | |
| Industry | 4.50 | |
| Servicemembers | 3.00 | |

The general agreement amongst stakeholders is that the traffic structure should be simplified and reduced. There are currently over 17,000 traffic lanes used by the personal property program. While none of the current policy alternatives emphasize this criterion, each alternative has attempted to streamline the existing network in some manner.

b. Payment Options

| Payment Options | | |
|-----------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 3.10 | 0.86 |
| Government | 2.86 | 1.08 |
| Providers | 3.33 | 0.76 |
| Relocation | 2.83 | 1.61 |
| Industry | 3.08 | 1.15 |
| Servicemembers | 3.36 | 0.63 |

Many stakeholders feel that DFAS should be the best option. However, due to DFAS' poor performance record, most recommend using a Government Credit Card or a Bank Service Contract. Government stakeholders are wary of the significant administrative burden caused by the use of the

Government Credit Card. Many stakeholders indicated that they support the use of a bank service contract not because it provided the greatest value, but because it is the least objectionable option.

c. Small Business Incentives

| Small Business Incentives | | |
|---------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Stakeholder | Average | Std. Dev. |
| Aggregate | 2.98 | 0.73 |
| Government | 3.14 | 0.61 |
| Providers | 4.75 | 0.35 |
| Relocation | 2.50 | 2.12 |
| Industry | 3.29 | 1.36 |
| Servicemembers | 2.50 | 0.24 |

There was a large range of values placed on limiting the impact of a policy change on small businesses. Government and the relocation industry view small business as a critical component of the moving industry's capacity. However, they feel that small businesses can be integrated into a network of carriers and freight forwarders to achieve greater service and less cost. Many small businesses have exclusive relationships with national carriers. This has caused widespread cynicism among government stakeholders when denoting which businesses are "small" and which are not. Government and relocation industry stakeholders feel that meeting small business requirements under the Small Business Act are sufficient for ensuring small business participation in the personal property program. Transportation providers disagree with this view and

support the introduction of policy features that limit or dispel the authority of the move manager and increase the participation of small businesses in the program.

C. CHAPTER SUMMARY

The interview process requires the collection, coding and reduction of the data into a meaningful framework. Data reduction refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the “raw” data that are generated from the interviews (Roberts and King, 1996. 250). Coding data allows for the interpretation and integration of the results. The valuation of the evaluation criteria by the stakeholders provides a basis for the evaluation of the policy alternatives from the each stakeholder group’s perspective. Chapter V, Data Analysis, will evaluate the alternative policies for reengineering DoD’s personal property program using a single set of evaluation criteria derived from the stakeholder analysis.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V. DATA ANALYSIS

A. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate the alternative policies for reengineering DoD's personal property program using a single set of evaluation criteria derived from a stakeholder analysis. Figure 12 displays the steps and supporting tasks that are used to analyze the data summarized in Chapter IV. Statistical standards and methods are employed to compare and contrast the three alternatives. The result of this process is the identification of a policy alternative or alternatives that best satisfy stakeholder criteria.

| Data Analysis Overview | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------|---|
| What? | Where? | Figure? | Method? |
| 1. Determine extent to which each policy alternative fulfills values stakeholder groups place on criteria | Chapter V | Appendix D | Absolute value of difference between stakeholders' and alternatives' values is calculated |
| 2. Determine extent to which each policy alternative satisfies stakeholder expectations as a whole | Chapter V | Appendix D | Sum differences for sub-goals and goals |
| 3. Determine the policy alternative that best satisfies each stakeholder groups' criteria | Chapter V | Figures 13-18 | Compare and contrast total differences |

Figure 12. Data Analysis Overview

B. EVALUATION OF POLICY ALTERNATIVES

The policy alternatives were evaluated from each stakeholder perspective as well as an aggregate perspective using a single set of criteria. Interview data were used to generate values for the evaluation criteria. The arithmetic mean of individual stakeholder responses represents the value a stakeholder group places

on a criterion. I then made a comparison between the mean for each criterion and the value assigned to a policy alternative shown in Figure 9.

The absolute value of the difference between the stakeholder group's expressed values and the value I assigned to each policy alternative was calculated from this comparison. The difference between these two values indicates the degree to which a policy alternative fulfills stakeholder expectations for that criterion. The lack of a difference indicates that the stakeholder's expectations have been more fully met. Thus, the greater the difference, the greater the degree of incompatibility between the stakeholder values and the policy alternative.

For example, government stakeholders placed an average value of "3.33" on the use of FAR-based contracts. I assigned a value of "5" to this criterion for the MTMC Pilot. The absolute value of the difference between the stakeholder group's expectations and the value I assigned to the MTMC pilot is "1.67 ($5 - 3.33 = 1.67$)."

The SAM pilot, on the other hand, has an assigned value of "3" for this criterion. Therefore, the difference in this case would be ".33." Thus, the SAM pilot comes closer to meeting government stakeholder expectations for the use of FAR-based contracts.

1. Evaluation of Aggregate

The final step of the evaluation process is to determine the policy alternative that best satisfies the stakeholder's criteria as a whole. This was accomplished by totaling the differences between a stakeholder group's expectations and a policy alternative's values. The total difference that is closest

to zero designates the policy alternative that best satisfies stakeholder expectations. Figure 13 presents the results of the evaluation for the aggregate of the stakeholder groups. Overall, the FSMP best satisfies stakeholder criteria. This is in a large part due to the move management services that the FSMP provides to the servicemember. The FSMP consistently fulfills stakeholder values to a greater extent than the other alternatives for the majority of sub-goals. Each policy alternative meets stakeholder expectations for reducing total cost and maintaining a competitive market to a similar extent. The largest disparity amongst alternatives in maintaining a competitive market is for payment options. The FSMP proposes the use of a bank service contract as a payment option. The SAM uses a government credit card, and the MTMC pilot continues to use DFAS.

| Aggregate Total Difference | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | SAM | FSMP | MTMC |
| Contracting Method | 0.03 | 0.97 | 1.97 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | 6.48 | 6.98 | 5.74 |
| Provider Qualification | 7.17 | 3.01 | 4.35 |
| Performance Measures | 4.13 | 1.19 | 1.57 |
| Movement Management | 13.04 | 5.96 | 12.94 |
| Improve Quality of Life | 30.85 | 18.11 | 26.57 |
| Price Strategy | 11.84 | 9.16 | 13.34 |
| Traffic Allocation | 12.23 | 10.69 | 9.95 |
| EDI Capability | 2.99 | 0.99 | 1.01 |
| Category & Service Structure | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Reduce Total Cost | 27.06 | 22.84 | 26.30 |
| Traffic Structure | 2.69 | 0.69 | 0.31 |
| Payment Options | 5.32 | 4.92 | 8.06 |
| SBA Compliance | 3.04 | 1.96 | 1.96 |
| Maintain a Competitive Market | 11.05 | 7.57 | 10.33 |
| TOTAL | 68.96 | 48.52 | 63.20 |

Figure 13. Aggregate Total Difference

2. Evaluation of Government Stakeholder Group

Figure 14 presents the results of the evaluation for the government stakeholder group. Overall, the FSMP best satisfies government stakeholder criteria. The values government stakeholders place on the sub-goals supporting improving the quality of life for servicemembers are congruent with the FSMP. However, the alternatives are nearly equivalent in meeting government stakeholder values for loss and damage claims. The MTMC pilot does as well as the FSMP in meeting the government's criteria for reducing total cost. Furthermore, the SAM pilot meets the government's criteria for maintaining a competitive market to a similar degree as the FSMP. However, the FSMP comes closer than the other alternatives to meeting government expectations for both reducing total cost *and* maintaining a competitive market.

| Government Total Difference | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | SAM | FSMP | MTMC |
| Contracting Method | 0.33 | 0.67 | 1.67 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | 7.00 | 7.00 | 6.42 |
| Provider Qualification | 6.38 | 3.76 | 5.04 |
| Performance Measures | 4.14 | 1.14 | 1.14 |
| Movement Management | 13.47 | 6.19 | 13.33 |
| Improve Quality of Life | 31.32 | 18.76 | 27.60 |
| Price Strategy | 12.13 | 9.57 | 13.27 |
| Traffic Allocation | 14.95 | 9.47 | 9.09 |
| EDI Capability | 3.57 | 1.57 | 0.43 |
| Category & Service Structure | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Reduce Total Cost | 30.65 | 22.61 | 24.79 |
| Traffic Structure | 2.57 | 0.57 | 0.43 |
| Payment Options | 5.15 | 4.57 | 8.85 |
| SBA Compliance | 2.72 | 2.14 | 2.14 |
| Maintain a Competitive Market | 10.44 | 7.28 | 11.42 |
| TOTAL | 72.41 | 48.65 | 63.81 |

Figure 14. Government Total Difference

3. Evaluation of Transportation Provider Stakeholder Sub-Group

Figure 15 presents the results of the evaluation for the transportation provider stakeholder sub-group. Altogether, the SAM alternative best satisfies the transportation providers' criteria. This is due, in part, to the extent to which the SAM pilot fulfills transportation providers' expectations for reducing total cost and maintaining a competitive market. In particular, the SAM pilot does better than the other two alternatives in meeting the transportation providers' criteria for allocating traffic and supporting small businesses. The MTMC pilot alternative best fulfills the values transportation providers place on improving customer satisfaction. The MTMC pilot does well in fulfilling stakeholder criteria for loss and damage claims and provider qualifications.

| Transportation Providers Total Difference | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | SAM | FSMP | MTMC |
| Contracting Method | 2.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | 4.50 | 10.50 | 3.50 |
| Provider Qualification | 9.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 |
| Performance Measures | 4.50 | 1.50 | 2.50 |
| Movement Management | 10.00 | 9.00 | 11.00 |
| Improve Quality of Life | 30.00 | 27.00 | 25.00 |
| Price Strategy | 13.50 | 12.50 | 13.50 |
| Traffic Allocation | 5.50 | 20.50 | 10.50 |
| EDI Capability | 2.50 | 0.50 | 1.50 |
| Category & Service Structure | 0.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Reduce Total Cost | 22.00 | 36.00 | 28.00 |
| Traffic Structure | 3.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Payment Options | 5.00 | 6.00 | 8.00 |
| SBA Compliance | 0.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| Maintain a Competitive Market | 8.50 | 11.50 | 12.50 |
| TOTAL | 60.50 | 74.50 | 65.50 |

Figure 15. Transportation Providers Total Difference

4. Evaluation of Relocation Manager Stakeholder Sub-Group

Figure 16 presents the results of the evaluation for the relocation manager stakeholder sub-group. The FSMP satisfies the relocation managers' criteria by a substantially larger margin than the other two alternatives. This outcome is consistent with the similarities between the relocation management concept and the focus of the FSMP. In almost every regard, the values relocation managers place on the criteria are comparable to the values I assigned to the FSMP.

| Relocation Managers Total Difference | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | SAM | FSMP | MTMC |
| Contracting Method | 1.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | 12.00 | 2.00 | 12.00 |
| Provider Qualification | 7.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 |
| Performance Measures | 4.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Movement Management | 17.00 | 4.00 | 18.00 |
| Improve Quality of Life | 42.00 | 11.00 | 36.00 |
| Price Strategy | 7.50 | 4.50 | 11.50 |
| Traffic Allocation | 20.00 | 4.00 | 16.00 |
| EDI Capability | 3.50 | 1.50 | 0.50 |
| Category & Service Structure | 0.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| Reduce Total Cost | 31.50 | 11.50 | 29.50 |
| Traffic Structure | 4.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 |
| Payment Options | 4.50 | 3.50 | 9.50 |
| SBA Compliance | 4.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Maintain a Competitive Market | 12.50 | 5.50 | 10.50 |
| TOTAL | 86.00 | 28.00 | 76.00 |

Figure 16. Relocation Managers Total Difference

5. Evaluation of Industry Stakeholder Group

Figure 17 presents results of the evaluation for the industry stakeholder group. As a whole, industry stakeholder criteria are best satisfied by the FSMP. The FSMP offers the greatest congruity with stakeholder expectations for

improving quality of life for the servicemember. There is a degree of equality between the SAM, MTMC and the FSMP when evaluating the ability of these alternatives to meet industry stakeholders desires for reducing total cost and maintaining a competitive market. Industry stakeholders do not appear to support either the SAM pilot's approach to provider qualifications or the MTMC pilot's use of DFAS as a payment option.

| Industry Total Difference | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | SAM | FSMP | MTMC |
| Contracting Method | 0.25 | 1.25 | 2.25 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | 7.75 | 6.25 | 6.75 |
| Provider Qualification | 8.25 | 2.25 | 3.25 |
| Performance Measures | 3.75 | 1.25 | 1.75 |
| Movement Management | 13.50 | 5.50 | 14.00 |
| Improve Quality of Life | 33.50 | 16.50 | 28.00 |
| Price Strategy | 10.67 | 6.67 | 12.67 |
| Traffic Allocation | 11.25 | 11.25 | 10.75 |
| EDI Capability | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Category & Service Structure | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Reduce Total Cost | 24.92 | 20.92 | 26.42 |
| Traffic Structure | 3.50 | 1.50 | 0.50 |
| Payment Options | 4.75 | 4.75 | 8.75 |
| SBA Compliance | 2.92 | 1.58 | 1.58 |
| Maintain a Competitive Market | 11.17 | 7.83 | 10.83 |
| TOTAL | 69.59 | 45.25 | 65.25 |

Figure 17. Industry Total Difference

6. Evaluation of Servicemember Stakeholder Group

Figure 18 presents the results of the evaluation for the servicemember stakeholder group. Overall, servicemembers demonstrate a preference for the FSMP over the other alternatives. Servicemembers prefer the MTMC alternative

with regards to claims settlement. However, they value the move management services provided by the FSMP.

| Servicemembers Total Difference | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | SAM | FSMP | MTMC |
| Contracting Method | 0.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | 6.68 | 7.66 | 4.34 |
| Provider Qualification | 6.90 | 4.30 | 5.30 |
| Performance Measures | 4.51 | 1.51 | 2.17 |
| Movement Management | 12.17 | 6.83 | 11.51 |
| Improve Quality of Life | 30.26 | 21.30 | 25.32 |
| Price Strategy | 12.73 | 11.27 | 14.07 |
| Traffic Allocation | 10.81 | 11.87 | 10.47 |
| EDI Capability | 2.40 | 0.40 | 1.60 |
| Category & Service Structure | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Reduce Total Cost | 25.94 | 25.54 | 28.14 |
| Traffic Structure | 2.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Payment Options | 5.08 | 6.42 | 7.58 |
| SBA Compliance | 4.00 | 2.66 | 2.66 |
| Maintain a Competitive Market | 11.08 | 9.08 | 11.24 |
| TOTAL | 67.28 | 55.92 | 64.70 |

Figure 18. Servicemembers Total Difference

C. CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter presents the data analysis necessary to support the evaluation of the three alternatives to reengineer the DoD's personal property program using a stakeholder approach. The policy alternatives were evaluated from each stakeholder perspective as well as an aggregate perspective using a single set of criteria. The result of this process is the identification of the Full Service Moving Program as the alternative that best satisfies each stakeholders group's criteria. Chapter VI draws conclusions and recommendations based on this analysis.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

The Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) is currently reengineering the DoD Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program. DoD is conducting three pilot projects in support of this effort. Each pilot project represents a policy alternative for improving moving services for military families. This thesis evaluates the policy alternatives for reengineering the DoD personal property program using a stakeholder approach.

The study provides a model for evaluating policy alternatives. Based on this model, evaluation criteria were established. Values were determined for these criteria by interviewing a convenience sample of stakeholders. Policy alternatives were then analyzed from each stakeholder perspective. Finally, a policy alternative was identified that best satisfies the criteria for each stakeholder as well as the aggregate of stakeholders. This chapter will summarize the study's findings based on the original research questions.

B. RESTATEMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Primary Research Question:

Which policy alternative for reengineering the DoD's personal property program best satisfies stakeholder criteria?

Subsidiary Research Questions:

1. What are the policy alternatives for reengineering the personal property program?
2. What are the criteria for evaluating for the policy alternatives?
3. Who are the stakeholders for the reengineering effort?
4. What value do the stakeholders place on the evaluation criteria?
5. Which policy alternative fulfills stakeholder criteria?

C. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Full Service Move Program (FSMP) best satisfies the criteria of all three stakeholders groups in aggregate. The extent to which the FSMP met stakeholders' expectations varied from stakeholder to stakeholder. However, the FSMP met stakeholder values for improving quality of life for the servicemember to the greatest extent.

All stakeholder groups place the highest value on improving the servicemember's quality of life. Stakeholders are consistent in placing the highest values on the following criteria:

- Full Replacement Value for Personal Property
- Reduced Claim Preparation Requirements
- Reduced Claim Settlement Period
- Providers' Qualification Based on Past Performance
- Single Point of Contact for the Move Process
- Improved Shipment Tracking
- Improved Delivery Coordination.

Stakeholders place the lowest value on reducing the impact on small business. Analysis of the interview results demonstrated that the following criteria are the most divisive or lowest valued:

- Claims Settlement with the Government
- Inclusion of the Service Contract Act
- Real Estate Assistance
- Continued use of the Current DoD Solicitation Process
- Distribution of Traffic by the Government
- Payment by DFAS
- Small Business Prime Contract Set-Asides.

During the course of the interview process, stakeholders, especially servicemembers, consistently placed a high value on improving the quality of life for servicemembers. Moreover, there is a consensus among stakeholders on issues relating to providing full replacement insurance and improving the claims process. Additionally, many of the expanded services that servicemembers place the highest value on can be provided under the current system. Servicemember satisfaction can be substantially improved by implementing non-divisive quality of life improvements. The most divisive issues identified in this study are mainly related to efforts to reduce total cost and maintain a competitive market. Disagreement between stakeholders on aspects of these two goals has been the primary cause of delays and difficulties in developing and testing alternative policies. Specifically, government's plan to use a relocation management company

to manage the personal property program has been vehemently opposed by transportation providers.

In expanding the Hunter Pilot into the FSMP, the government was forced to compromise on a number of critical components of this alternative. These compromises have diminished the impact a relocation management company can have on the personal property program. In its proposed version, the FSMP does not provide the relocation management company with the authority it has over carriers in a purely commercial environment, yet continues to hold the relocation company to commercial standards. Thus, the commercial move concept can not be adequately tested in a diluted form. A short-term solution to this impasse, may be an expansion of the SAM or MTMC pilots or the development of a separate pilot to test the feasibility of achieving quality of life goals without the use of a relocation management company.

D. LIMITATIONS

This study faced a number of limitations that are common to policy analysis. These limitations can be grouped into three major categories: scope limitations, institutional obstacles, and technical obstacles. Each of these limitations provides a challenge to the evaluation process.

1. Scope Limitations

The scope of this thesis was limited to an evaluation of the current policy alternatives. No conscious effort was made to identify other alternatives or

solutions to the presenting problem. Interviewees did provide other options that did not fit within the context of this study. Furthermore, evaluation criteria were gauged to assess the differences between alternatives and determine the values of stakeholders. As a result, the criteria are not useful in identifying other criteria that may be highly valued by the stakeholders.

2. Institutional Obstacles

Institutional obstacles include the influence of political pressure on the policy development and evaluation, the effect of multiple competing stakeholders on the policy evaluation process, and the difficulties in assessing a complex public policy initiative. The direction the reengineering effort has taken has been influenced by the dynamics of the political environment. Furthermore, the complexity and size of the personal property program coupled with numerous stakeholders makes it difficult to develop criteria capable of encompassing all aspects of the reengineering effort.

The policy evaluation effort faces significant obstacles unique to the public sector. Political maneuvering can often cause one policy alternative to be favored at the expense of another. Furthermore, restrictions may be placed on the evaluation process that limit the full range of options or solutions available to the decision-makers. The reengineering effort is not exempt from these political dynamics. DoD has tended to emphasize the FSMP at the expense of the other pilots, especially the SAM alternative. DoD has also concentrated on developing

an alternative that is palatable to all stakeholders. As a result, pilot projects have been used to determine which aspects of the program can be implemented successfully, rather than a means to evaluate three exclusive alternatives in an environment that encourage innovation and learning from mistakes.

Compounding this problem is the vagueness of stakeholders in articulating their sub-goals and goals. A critical step in the evaluation process is developing adequate evaluation criteria. However, the presence of so many powerful stakeholder groups forced the evaluator to make subjective judgements as to which goals and sub-goal to recognize and at what level in the mapping process to place them. Furthermore, the complexity of the personal property made it difficult to discern and capture the nuances embodied in certain criteria. Bonser, McGregor, and Oster point out that "the real world of public policy is messy, and it is not usually possible to assemble all of the information that one would like in order to prepare a complete assessment of all conceivable policy options. Most inquires are under time and financial pressures and suffer from incomplete or inadequate data (Bonser, McGregor, and Oster, p. 50)." A concerted effort was made to validate assumptions and probe complex issues associated with the reengineering effort throughout the evaluation and data collection process.

3. Technical Obstacles

Technical obstacles presented themselves in the form of time and resource constraints. The use of a convenience sample provides a means to identify the

stakeholder values relating to the reengineering effort. However, a convenience sample is not a random sample. The use of a non-random small sample introduces the possibility of a bias in any results. Thus, the results cannot be generalized to a large population.

Additionally, criteria are equally weighted for the purposes of this study. The values of the stakeholders were used to choose between the policy alternatives on a criterion by criterion basis. There was no attempt to weight criteria differently in calculating the extent each policy alternative fulfilled stakeholder expectations as a whole.

E. GENERAL COMMENTS

During the course of the interview process, various respondents often provided additional comments. Stakeholder comments tended to focus on issues that are important or of concern to them personally. Topics discussed here are representative of the comments received from individual stakeholders.

A number of comments referred to changes to the damage claim process. One issue is the lack of true full replacement protection for the servicemember in any of the proposals. Each proposal increases the liability of the carrier, but this liability is based on a dollar per pound formula. There was also concern raised over the need for an arbitration mechanism when the claim is settled with a carrier.

Another concern was that by requiring binding estimates, there is an incentive for transportation providers to overcharge servicemembers. Carriers are

compelled to inflate estimates in order to reduce the risk of underestimating the true cost of the additional service. Anecdotal evidence suggests that carriers do not lower billing charges if true cost is less than the estimate. Efforts to limit servicemember liability may prove more successful by managing the process, and not by mandating the result.

Finally, numerous “horror stories” were told by servicemembers during the interviews. A central theme to these stories is the frustration servicemembers have with the current system. Servicemember often feel “powerless” during the move process. A low quality move process is often coupled with poor customer service and ineffective feedback to the servicemember on complaints. Servicemembers are unable to ensure they receive the best carrier and when they receive poor service they feel no one is held responsible.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study focused on evaluating the policy alternatives for the reengineering of the DoD Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program from a stakeholder approach. This study did not seek to explore the dynamics of the developing public policy, nor did it attempt to address implementation issues. Further research would be useful in determining critical steps and possible obstacles in the development and implementation processes.

The major contribution of this study is the development of a model to assess stakeholder views and values on alternative policies. Two additional steps

are needed to generate results that will sustain a scientific model. Further studies should attempt to incorporate these two steps. The reliability of this study can be greatly increased by an assessment of the pilot projects by another evaluator or evaluators. Furthermore, the use of a random sample will allow the results of the analysis to be used to make inferences about the characteristics of a population.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A. DEFINITIONS

The following terms have been defined as listed below for the purposes of this study:

AMSA: The American Moving and Storage Association is a national trade association of the moving and storage industry.

Best Value: A procurement strategy that takes into account both cost and quality in awarding contracts.

CINC: Commander in Chief refers to the commander of a Unified Command.

Criterion: A performance measure.

DOD: Department of Defense.

DFAS: The Defense Finance and Accounting Service provides responsive, professional finance and accounting services to the Department of Defense.

EWG: Executive Working Group

FSMP: The Full Service Move Program is an expansion of the Hunter Pilot with certain modifications based on earlier lessons learned from the Hunter Test.

GAO: The General Accounting Office is the investigative arm of Congress. GAO is charged with examining matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds. GAO performs audits and evaluations of government programs and activities.

Goal: A target of an activity or policy expressed as a measurable outcome.

HGFA: The Household Goods Forwarders Association is a national trade association that comprises all facets of the moving industry, including moving and storage firms, national van lines, line-haul firms, international and domestic forwarders, port agents, claims adjusters, material providers, insurance providers, technology firms, and others.

Hunter Pilot: Managed by the Department of the Army as a separate pilot effort to determine whether the commercial business practice of outsourcing can alleviate known problem areas in the personal property program.

Industry: Includes both transportation providers and relocation managers.

IPPT: Integrated Product Process Team.

Military Mobility Coalition: Is an ad hoc organization formed in the spring of 1996 to represent the relocation management industry's interests in working with the Department of Defense's household goods reengineering initiatives.

MTMC: The Military Traffic Management Command is a sub-command of the United States Transportation Command that provides the Department of Defense worldwide single port management, transportation, and traffic management services; deployment planning and engineering.

MTMC Pilot: Managed by the Military Traffic Management Command in an effort to correct deficiencies in the personal property program through reengineering.

OSD: The Office of the Secretary of Defense is the organization that establishes and reviews policies, and coordinates activities for the Secretary of Defense.

Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program: The Department of Defense (DOD) program that is managed by the Military Traffic Management Command. Provides for the shipping and storing of DOD military and civilian employees' household goods and personal effects.

Policy Analysis: A systematic approach to making policy choices. Its purpose is to assist policymakers in choosing a preferred course of action amid multiple complex alternatives.

Policy Evaluation: Emphasizes examining alternative policies, as contrasted to describing them or explaining why they exist.

PPSO: Personal Property Shipping Offices manage the daily operations of the personal property program.

Relocation Managers: Provide a wide range of relocation services through an integrated network of transportation providers, real estate agents, and move coordinators.

SAM: The Servicemember Arranged Move is managed by the Department of Navy as a separate pilot effort to test the option of allowing servicemembers to choose their own carrier as well as coordinate their move with that carrier.

SECDEF: Secretary of Defense.

Stake: A claim that each stakeholder has on the organization or program. A stake may be tangible or intangible, explicit or implicit. A stake may also be political, economic, social or psychological in nature.

Stakeholder: Those parties who either affect or are affected by an organization's actions, behavior, and policies

Sub-goal: A set of activities that support a goal.

Transportation Providers: Includes both motor carriers and freight forwarders.

TMO: Traffic Management Offices are base activities that arrange the movement of household goods by coordinating with the commercial carrier industry and the military customer.

USTRANSCOM: The United States Transportation Command is responsible for planning and coordinating strategic mobility for the United States Armed Forces.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:

Stakeholder Group: G I S

Sub-Group:

| Sub-goals | Measurement Criteria and Sub-criteria | | Extent Valued |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---------------|
| Contracting Method | FAR -based | | |
| Loss and Damage Claim | Full Replacement | | |
| | Direct Claim Settlement | Move Manager | |
| | | Transportation Provider | |
| | | Government | |
| | Reduced claim preparation requirements | | |
| Reduced claim settlement period | | | |
| Provider Qualification | Financial stability | | |
| | Ensured capacity | | |
| | Past performance | | |
| | Inclusion of Service Contract Act | | |
| | Inconvenience payments | | |
| Provider Performance Measurement | Customer Surveys | | |
| | Random Inspections | | |
| | Periodic Performance Assessment | | |
| Move Management | Pre-move counseling | | |
| | Single point of contact move management | | |
| | Binding estimates for excess costs | | |
| | Destination information | | |
| | Shipment tracking | | |
| | Delivery coordination | | |
| | Real Estate assistance | | |
| Pricing Strategy | Current DOD solicitation process | Domestic | |
| | | International | |
| | Commercial Tariff | Domestic | |
| | GSA Tender 1-W | Domestic | |
| | | International | |
| | Single-Factor-Rate | Domestic | |
| | | International | |
| Commissions for move manager | | | |
| Traffic Allocation | (Consolidation) Fewer contracts providing more services per contract | | |
| | Traffic distribution based solely on quality | | |
| | Traffic distribution performed by: | Move Manager | |
| | | Servicemember | |
| | | Government | |
| | Elimination of the Traffic Distribution Record | | |
| | Reduction in Contracts awarded | | |
| Increase length of Contract award | | | |
| EDI capability required | | | |
| Category and Service Structure | Reduction in number of movement and storage categories | | |
| Traffic Structure | Change current structure of AOR to RA | | |
| Payment | DFAS | | |
| | Bank Service Contract | | |
| | Government Credit Card | | |
| SBA Compliance Means | Application of Small Business Act | | |
| | Small Business prime contractor set asides | | |

My goal is determine the value you place on a number of criteria relating to the reengineering of the personal property program (moving and storage of household goods). I will name an objective and I would like to know how important you feel that objective is to any effort to change the current personal property program.

Please rate the objectives using the following scale:

- 0 = Not applicable
- 1 = Not Important
- 2 = Low Importance
- 3 = Medium Importance
- 4 = High Importance
- 5 = Critical

APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW RESPONSES

[illegible]

| Stakeholder Group | | Government | Government | Government | Government | Government | Government | Government | Average | Std Dev |
|--|---------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|
| Activity | MTMC-PA | MTMC-P | MTMC-P | USTRAN | Navy-HQ | Navy-PO | FSMP | FSMP | | |
| Full-based contracts | | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3.33 | 1.63 |
| Full replacement | | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.86 | 0.38 |
| Claims settlement with Move Manager | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3.71 | 1.89 |
| Claims settlement with Transportation Provider | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4.14 | 0.90 |
| Claims settlement with Government | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2.29 | 1.25 |
| Reduced claim preparation requirements | | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.57 | 1.13 |
| Reduced claim settlement period | | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.43 | 0.98 |
| Provider financial stability | | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4.14 | 0.69 |
| Provider ensured capacity | | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4.14 | 0.90 |
| Provider past performance | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4.14 | 0.69 |
| Provider inclusion of Service Contract Act | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.33 | 0.82 |
| Provider inconvenience payments | | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3.71 | 0.76 |
| Customer surveys | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| Random inspections | | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.14 | 0.38 |
| Periodic performance assessment | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 0.82 |
| Pre-move counseling | | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.71 | 0.49 |
| Single point of contact | | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.43 | 1.13 |
| Binding estimates | | | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.33 | 1.21 |
| Destination information | | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.29 | 0.76 |
| Shipment tracking | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.14 | 1.21 |
| Delivery coordination | | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4.43 | 0.79 |
| Real Estate assistance | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2.00 | 1.15 |
| Pricing-DOD solicitations (Domestic) | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1.57 | 0.53 |
| Pricing-DOD solicitations (International) | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.57 | 0.53 |
| Pricing-Commercial tariff (Domestic) | | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3.57 | 1.62 |
| Pricing-GSA tender (Domestic) | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2.57 | 1.13 |
| Pricing-GSA tender (International) | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2.57 | 1.13 |
| Pricing-Single Factor Rate (Domestic) | | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3.14 | 1.35 |
| Pricing-Single Factor Rate (International) | | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3.71 | 1.11 |
| Commissions for Move Manager | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2.57 | 1.27 |
| Contract consolidation | | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3.57 | 1.62 |
| Quality distribution | | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3.43 | 1.27 |
| Distribution by Move Manager | | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3.71 | 1.89 |
| Distribution by Servicemember | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2.71 | 1.11 |
| Distribution by Government | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3.14 | 1.68 |
| Elimination of TDR | | | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4.67 | 0.52 |
| Reduction in contract awards | | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.14 | 1.68 |
| Increase in length of contracts | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3.86 | 1.07 |
| EDI capability | | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4.57 | 0.53 |
| Reduction in categories | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3.00 | 1.73 |
| Change traffic structure | | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.57 | 0.53 |
| Payment by DFAS | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1.86 | 1.07 |
| Payment by bank service contract | | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4.00 | 1.15 |
| Payment by Government credit card | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2.71 | 1.70 |
| Application of SBA | | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.57 | 1.40 |
| Small business prime set asides | | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2.71 | 1.38 |

| Stakeholder Group | | Industry | Provider | Industry | Average | Std Dev | Industry | Relocation | Industry | Relocation-Cendant Mob. | Average | Std Dev | Average | Std Dev |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---------------|---------|---------|----------|------------|----------|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Activity | Industry | Provider | Industry | Provider-AMSA | Average | Std Dev | Industry | Relocation | Industry | Relocation-Cendant Mob. | Average | Std Dev | Average | Std Dev |
| FAR-based contracts | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 2.75 | 2.06 |
| Full replacement | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1.41 | 1.00 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Claims settlement with Move Manager | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 2.31 | 2.31 |
| Claims settlement with Transportation Provider | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1.41 | 3.50 | 1.91 | 1.91 |
| Claims settlement with Government | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Reduced claim preparation requirements | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1.41 | 1.00 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Reduced claim settlement period | 5 | 2 | 3.5 | 2.12 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.25 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| Provider financial stability | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 4.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Provider ensured capacity | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0.00 | 3.75 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Provider past performance | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Provider inclusion of Service Contract Act | 1 | 2 | 1.5 | 0.71 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 1.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Provider inconvenience payments | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1.41 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 1.41 | 3.50 | 1.29 | 1.29 |
| Customer surveys | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 4.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Random inspections | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1.41 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2.5 | 0.71 | 3.25 | 1.26 | 1.26 |
| Periodic performance assessment | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 0.71 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 1.41 | 3.75 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Pre-move counseling | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.75 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Single point of contact | 5 | 2 | 3.5 | 2.12 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.25 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| Binding estimates | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2.83 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.5 | 0.71 | 3.25 | 1.71 | 1.71 |
| Destination information | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 0.71 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 4.00 | 0.82 | 0.82 |
| Shipment tracking | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 0.71 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 4.00 | 0.82 | 0.82 |
| Delivery coordination | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.75 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Real Estate assistance | 1 | 2 | 1.5 | 0.71 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 3.00 | 1.83 | 1.83 |
| Pricing-DOD solicitations (Domestic) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 0.58 | 0.58 |
| Pricing-DOD solicitations (International) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 0.58 | 0.58 |
| Pricing-Commercial tariff (Domestic) | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2.83 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Pricing-GSA tender (Domestic) | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2.83 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Pricing-GSA tender (International) | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2.83 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Pricing-Single Factor Rate (Domestic) | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2.83 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.00 | 2.67 | 2.08 | 2.08 |
| Pricing-Single Factor Rate (International) | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3.5 | 2.12 | 4.00 | 1.41 | 1.41 |
| Commissions for Move Manager | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 2.31 | 2.31 |
| Contract consolidation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 2.75 | 2.06 | 2.06 |
| Quality distribution | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.5 | 0.71 | 4.00 | 0.82 | 0.82 |
| Distribution by Move Manager | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 2.31 | 2.31 |
| Distribution by Servicemember | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1.41 | 3.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Distribution by Government | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 2.50 | 1.73 | 1.73 |
| Elimination of TDR | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1.41 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.41 | 1.41 |
| Reduction in contract awards | 2 | 1 | 1.5 | 0.71 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 3.25 | 2.06 | 2.06 |
| Increase in length of contracts | 5 | 2 | 3.5 | 2.12 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.25 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| EDI capability | 5 | 2 | 3.5 | 2.12 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 4.00 | 1.41 | 1.41 |
| Reduction in categories | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 0.71 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2.5 | 2.12 | 3.00 | 1.41 | 1.41 |
| Change traffic structure | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 4.50 | 0.58 | 0.58 |
| Payment by DFAS | 2 | 3 | 2.5 | 0.71 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 1.75 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Payment by bank service contract | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 0.71 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 3.75 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Payment by Government credit card | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1.41 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 0.71 | 3.75 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Application of SBA | 5 | 4 | 4.5 | 0.71 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1.41 | 4.25 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Small business prime set asides | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 2.33 | 2.31 | 2.31 |

(4 servicemembers)

| Stakeholder Group | Servicemember | Servicemember | Servicemember | Servicemember | Servicemember | Servicemember | Servicemember | Average | Std Dev |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------|---------|
| Activity | | | | | | | | | |
| FAR-based contracts | | 1 | | | 5 | 3 | | 3.00 | 2.00 |
| Full replacement | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 4.83 | 0.41 |
| Claims settlement with Move Manager | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | | | 4.17 | 1.52 |
| Claims settlement with Transportation Provider | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | | 4.33 | 1.37 |
| Claims settlement with Government | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 2.00 | 1.55 |
| Reduced claim preparation requirements | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | | 4.00 | 1.10 |
| Reduced claim settlement period | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 4.67 | 0.52 |
| Provider financial stability | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | 4.50 | 1.52 |
| Provider ensured capacity | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | | 5.45 | 0.84 |
| Provider past performance | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | | 4.50 | 0.55 |
| Provider inclusion of Service Contract Act | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | | 3.20 | 1.64 |
| Provider inconvenience payments | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | | 4.40 | 0.89 |
| Customer surveys | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | 4.83 | 0.98 |
| Random inspections | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | | 4.67 | 1.37 |
| Periodic performance assessment | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | 4.67 | 1.51 |
| Pre-move counseling | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | | 4.00 | 1.67 |
| Single point of contact | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | | 4.50 | 0.55 |
| Binding estimates | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | 3.50 | 1.52 |
| Destination information | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 5.00 | 1.26 |
| Shipment tracking | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | | 5.47 | 0.52 |
| Delivery coordination | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | | 5.41 | 0.41 |
| Real Estate assistance | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4.27 | 1.21 |
| Pricing-DOD solicitations (Domestic) | | 1 | 3 | | | 1 | | 1.67 | 1.15 |
| Pricing-DOD solicitations (International) | | 1 | 3 | | | 1 | | 1.67 | 1.15 |
| Pricing-Commercial tariff (Domestic) | | 5 | 3 | | | 3 | | 3.67 | 1.15 |
| Pricing-GSA tender (Domestic) | | 3 | 4 | | | 2 | | 3.00 | 1.00 |
| Pricing-GSA tender (International) | | 3 | 4 | | | 2 | | 3.00 | 1.00 |
| Pricing-Single Factor Rate (Domestic) | | 3 | 3 | | | 4 | | 3.33 | 0.58 |
| Pricing-Single Factor Rate (International) | | 3 | 3 | | | 4 | | 3.33 | 0.58 |
| Commissions for Move Manager | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | 3.24 | 0.89 |
| Contract consolidation | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 3.40 | 0.71 |
| Quality distribution | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | | 4.00 | 1.10 |
| Distribution by Move Manager | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | | 3.67 | 1.37 |
| Distribution by Servicemember | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | 4.17 | 0.98 |
| Distribution by Government | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 3.67 | 1.03 |
| Elimination of TDR | | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | 4.80 | 0.84 |
| Reduction in contract awards | | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | 3.50 | 1.00 |
| Increase in length of contracts | | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | 3.00 | 1.41 |
| EDI capability | | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 4.34 | 0.55 |
| Reduction in categories | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Change traffic structure | | 3 | 3 | | | | | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Payment by DFAS | 1 | 3 | | 4 | 3 | 3 | | 2.75 | 1.26 |
| Payment by bank service contract | 4 | 4 | | | 2 | 2 | | 3.33 | 1.15 |
| Payment by Government credit card | 4 | 4 | | | 4 | 4 | | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| Application of SBA | | 5 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 2.67 | 2.08 |
| Small business prime set asides | | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1.23 | 1.50 |

(5 comparison chart)

| Stakeholder Group Sample Size (n) | Aggregate n = 17 | | | Government n = 7 | | | Providers n = 2 | | | Relocation n = 2 | | | Industry n = 4 | | | Servicemembers n = 6 | | |
|--|---------------------|---------|--|---------------------|---------|--|--------------------|---------|--|---------------------|---------|--|-------------------|---------|--|-------------------------|---------|--|
| | Average | Std Dev | | Average | Std Dev | | Average | Std Dev | | Average | Std Dev | | Average | Std Dev | | Average | Std Dev | |
| FAR-based contracts | 3.03 | 0.29 | | 3.33 | 1.63 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 2.75 | 2.06 | | 3.00 | 2.00 | |
| Full replacement | 4.73 | 0.20 | | 4.86 | 0.38 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.50 | 1.00 | | 4.83 | 0.41 | |
| Claims settlement with Move Manager | 2.96 | 0.77 | | 3.71 | 1.89 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 3.00 | 2.31 | | 2.17 | 1.52 | |
| Claims settlement with Transportation Provider | 3.66 | 0.43 | | 4.14 | 0.90 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 2.00 | 1.41 | | 3.50 | 1.91 | | 3.33 | 1.37 | |
| Claims settlement with Government | 2.10 | 1.01 | | 2.29 | 1.25 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 3.00 | 1.55 | |
| Direct Claims Settlement | 2.90 | 0.78 | | 3.38 | 0.97 | | 2.33 | 2.31 | | 2.67 | 2.08 | | 2.50 | 1.32 | | 2.83 | 0.60 | |
| Reduced claim preparation requirements | 4.36 | 0.31 | | 4.57 | 1.13 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.50 | 1.00 | | 4.00 | 1.10 | |
| Reduced claim settlement period | 4.45 | 0.21 | | 4.43 | 0.98 | | 3.50 | 2.12 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.25 | 1.50 | | 4.67 | 0.52 | |
| Provider financial stability | 3.96 | 0.41 | | 4.14 | 0.69 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 4.25 | 0.50 | | 3.50 | 1.52 | |
| Provider ensured capacity | 4.13 | 0.38 | | 4.14 | 0.90 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 3.00 | 0.00 | | 3.75 | 0.96 | | 4.50 | 0.84 | |
| Provider past performance | 4.21 | 0.26 | | 4.14 | 0.69 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 4.50 | 0.55 | |
| Provider inclusion of Service Contract Act | 2.59 | 1.17 | | 3.33 | 0.82 | | 1.50 | 0.71 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 1.25 | 0.50 | | 3.20 | 1.64 | |
| Provider inconvenience payments | 3.54 | 0.16 | | 3.71 | 0.76 | | 3.00 | 1.41 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 3.50 | 1.29 | | 3.40 | 0.89 | |
| Customer surveys | 4.03 | 0.21 | | 4.00 | 1.00 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 4.25 | 0.50 | | 3.83 | 0.98 | |
| Random inspections | 3.35 | 0.28 | | 3.14 | 0.38 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 2.50 | 0.71 | | 3.25 | 1.26 | | 3.67 | 1.37 | |
| Periodic performance assessment | 3.81 | 0.17 | | 4.00 | 0.82 | | 3.50 | 0.71 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 3.75 | 0.96 | | 3.67 | 1.51 | |
| Pre-move counseling | 4.15 | 1.00 | | 4.71 | 0.49 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.75 | 0.50 | | 3.00 | 1.67 | |
| Single point of contact | 4.39 | 0.13 | | 4.43 | 1.13 | | 3.50 | 2.12 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.25 | 1.50 | | 4.50 | 0.55 | |
| Binding estimates | 3.69 | 0.57 | | 4.33 | 1.21 | | 3.00 | 2.83 | | 3.50 | 0.71 | | 3.25 | 1.71 | | 3.50 | 1.52 | |
| Destination information | 3.43 | 0.52 | | 3.29 | 0.76 | | 3.50 | 0.71 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 4.00 | 0.82 | | 3.00 | 1.26 | |
| Shipment tracking | 4.27 | 0.35 | | 4.14 | 1.21 | | 3.50 | 0.71 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 4.00 | 0.82 | | 4.67 | 0.52 | |
| Delivery coordination | 4.45 | 0.29 | | 4.43 | 0.79 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.75 | 0.50 | | 4.17 | 0.41 | |
| Real Estate assistance | 2.56 | 0.51 | | 2.00 | 1.15 | | 1.50 | 0.71 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 3.00 | 1.83 | | 2.67 | 1.21 | |
| Pricing-DOD solicitations (Domestic) | 1.58 | 0.08 | | 1.57 | 0.53 | | 2.00 | 0.00 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 1.50 | 0.58 | | 1.67 | 1.15 | |
| Pricing-DOD solicitations (International) | 1.58 | 0.08 | | 1.57 | 0.53 | | 2.00 | 0.00 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 1.50 | 0.58 | | 1.67 | 1.15 | |
| Pricing-Commercial tariff (Domestic) | 3.75 | 0.23 | | 3.57 | 1.62 | | 3.00 | 2.83 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.00 | 2.00 | | 3.67 | 1.15 | |
| Pricing-GSA tender (Domestic) | 2.52 | 0.50 | | 2.57 | 1.13 | | 3.00 | 2.83 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 2.00 | 2.00 | | 3.00 | 1.00 | |
| Pricing-GSA tender (International) | 2.52 | 0.50 | | 2.57 | 1.13 | | 3.00 | 2.83 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 2.00 | 2.00 | | 3.00 | 1.00 | |
| Pricing-Single Factor Rate (Domestic) | 3.05 | 0.34 | | 3.14 | 1.35 | | 3.00 | 2.83 | | 2.00 | 0.00 | | 2.67 | 2.08 | | 3.33 | 0.58 | |
| Pricing-Single Factor Rate (International) | 3.68 | 0.33 | | 3.71 | 1.11 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 3.50 | 2.12 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 3.33 | 0.58 | |
| Commissions for Move Manager | 2.66 | 0.31 | | 2.57 | 1.27 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 3.00 | 2.31 | | 2.40 | 0.89 | |
| Contract consolidation | 3.44 | 0.64 | | 3.57 | 1.82 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 2.75 | 2.06 | | 4.00 | 0.71 | |
| Quality distribution | 3.81 | 0.33 | | 3.43 | 1.27 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 3.50 | 0.71 | | 4.00 | 0.82 | | 4.00 | 1.10 | |
| Distribution by Move Manager | 3.13 | 0.54 | | 3.71 | 1.89 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 3.00 | 2.31 | | 2.67 | 1.37 | |
| Distribution by Servicemember | 3.46 | 0.73 | | 2.71 | 1.11 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 3.00 | 1.41 | | 3.50 | 1.00 | | 4.17 | 0.98 | |
| Distribution by Government | 2.77 | 0.33 | | 3.14 | 1.68 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 2.50 | 1.73 | | 2.67 | 1.03 | |
| Distribution Performance | 3.12 | 0.35 | | 3.19 | 0.50 | | 3.00 | 1.73 | | 3.00 | 2.00 | | 3.00 | 0.50 | | 3.17 | 0.87 | |
| Elimination of TDR | 4.16 | 0.45 | | 4.67 | 0.52 | | 3.00 | 1.41 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 3.80 | 0.84 | |
| Reduction in contract awards | 3.30 | 0.18 | | 3.14 | 1.68 | | 1.50 | 0.71 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 3.25 | 2.06 | | 3.50 | 1.00 | |
| Increase in length of contracts | 3.70 | 0.64 | | 3.86 | 1.07 | | 3.50 | 2.12 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.25 | 1.50 | | 3.00 | 1.41 | |
| EDI capability | 3.99 | 0.59 | | 4.57 | 0.53 | | 3.50 | 2.12 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 3.40 | 0.55 | |
| Reduction in categories | 3.00 | 0.00 | | 3.00 | 1.73 | | 3.50 | 0.71 | | 2.50 | 2.12 | | 3.00 | 1.41 | | 3.00 | 0.00 | |
| Change traffic structure | 3.69 | 0.76 | | 3.57 | 0.53 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 4.50 | 0.58 | | 3.00 | 0.00 | |
| Payment by DFAS | 2.12 | 0.55 | | 1.86 | 1.07 | | 2.50 | 0.71 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 1.75 | 0.96 | | 2.75 | 1.26 | |
| Payment by bank service contract | 3.69 | 0.34 | | 4.00 | 1.15 | | 3.50 | 0.71 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | | 3.75 | 0.50 | | 3.33 | 1.15 | |
| Payment by Government credit card | 3.49 | 0.68 | | 2.71 | 1.70 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 3.50 | 0.71 | | 3.75 | 0.96 | | 4.00 | 0.00 | |
| Application of SBA | 3.50 | 0.79 | | 3.57 | 1.40 | | 4.50 | 0.71 | | 4.00 | 1.41 | | 4.25 | 0.96 | | 2.67 | 2.08 | |
| Small business prime set asides | 2.46 | 0.22 | | 2.71 | 1.38 | | 5.00 | 0.00 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 2.33 | 2.31 | | 2.33 | 1.50 | |

(6 goals and subgoals)

| | Aggregate | | Government | | Providers | | Relocation | | Industry | | Servicemembers | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|------------|---------|-----------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|----------------|---------|
| | Average | Std Dev | Average | Std Dev | Average | Std Dev | Average | Std Dev | Average | Std Dev | Average | Std Dev |
| Contracting Method | 3.03 | 0.29 | 3.33 | 1.63 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 4.50 | 0.71 | 2.75 | 2.06 | 3.00 | 2.00 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | 4.11 | 0.82 | 4.31 | 0.64 | 3.46 | 0.79 | 4.42 | 1.17 | 3.94 | 0.97 | 4.08 | 0.91 |
| Provider Qualification | 3.69 | 0.66 | 3.90 | 0.36 | 3.40 | 1.19 | 3.30 | 1.40 | 3.35 | 1.21 | 3.82 | 0.63 |
| Performance Measures | 3.73 | 0.34 | 3.71 | 0.49 | 3.83 | 0.29 | 3.67 | 1.04 | 3.75 | 0.50 | 3.72 | 0.10 |
| Movement Management | 3.85 | 0.68 | 3.90 | 0.95 | 3.43 | 1.02 | 4.57 | 0.53 | 4.00 | 0.68 | 3.64 | 0.80 |
| Improve Quality of Life | 3.68 | 0.40 | 3.83 | 0.35 | 3.02 | 1.15 | 4.09 | 0.57 | 3.56 | 0.52 | 3.65 | 0.40 |
| Price Strategy | 2.67 | 0.82 | 2.66 | 0.81 | 2.69 | 1.03 | 2.44 | 1.80 | 2.58 | 1.02 | 2.76 | 0.77 |
| Traffic Allocation | 3.59 | 0.35 | 3.64 | 0.53 | 2.75 | 1.24 | 4.33 | 0.80 | 3.54 | 0.54 | 3.58 | 0.36 |
| EDI Capability | 3.99 | | 4.57 | | 3.50 | | 4.50 | | 4.00 | | 3.40 | |
| Category & Service Structure | 3.00 | | 3.00 | | 3.50 | | 2.50 | | 3.00 | | 3.00 | |
| Reduce Total Cost | 3.31 | 0.59 | 3.47 | 0.84 | 3.11 | 0.45 | 3.44 | 1.13 | 3.28 | 0.62 | 3.18 | 0.37 |
| Traffic Structure | 3.69 | | 3.57 | | 4.00 | | 5.00 | | 4.50 | | 3.00 | |
| Payment Options | 3.10 | 0.86 | 2.86 | 1.08 | 3.33 | 0.76 | 2.83 | 1.61 | 3.08 | 1.15 | 3.36 | 0.63 |
| SBA Compliance | 2.98 | 0.73 | 3.14 | 0.61 | 4.75 | 0.35 | 2.50 | 2.12 | 3.29 | 1.36 | 2.50 | 0.24 |
| Maintain a Competitive Market | 3.26 | 0.38 | 3.19 | 0.36 | 4.03 | 0.71 | 3.44 | 1.36 | 3.63 | 0.76 | 2.95 | 0.43 |

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX D. ANALYSIS

(1 aggregate results)

| Goal | Sub-goal | Criteria | Sub-criteria | Value | SAM | Difference | ESMP | Difference | RTMC | Difference |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|-----|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| Improve Quality of Life | Contracting Method | FAR-based | | 3.03 | 3 | 0.07 | 4 | 0.97 | 5 | 1.97 |
| | Loss and Damage Claim | Full Replacement | | 4.73 | 5 | 0.27 | 5 | 0.27 | 4 | 0.73 |
| | | Direct Claim Settlement | Move Manager | 2.96 | 1 | 1.96 | 5 | 2.04 | 1 | 1.96 |
| | | | Transportation Provider | 3.66 | 5 | 1.34 | 1 | 2.66 | 4 | 0.34 |
| | | | Government | 2.10 | 2 | 0.10 | 1 | 1.10 | 3 | 0.90 |
| | | Reduced claim preparation requirements | | 4.36 | 2 | 2.36 | 4 | 0.36 | 4 | 0.36 |
| | | Reduced claim settlement period | | 4.45 | 4 | 0.45 | 5 | 0.55 | 3 | 1.45 |
| | Provider Qualification | Financial stability | | 3.96 | 2 | 1.96 | 4 | 0.04 | 3 | 0.96 |
| | | Ensured capacity | | 4.13 | 1 | 3.13 | 4 | 0.13 | 4 | 0.13 |
| | | Past performance | | 4.21 | 4 | 0.21 | 5 | 0.79 | 3 | 1.21 |
| Reduce Total Cost | | Inclusion of Service Contract Act | | 2.59 | 4 | 1.41 | 1 | 1.59 | 1 | 1.59 |
| | | Inconvenience payments | | 3.54 | 4 | 0.46 | 4 | 0.46 | 4 | 0.46 |
| | Provider Performance Measurement | Customer Surveys | | 4.03 | 5 | 0.97 | 4 | 0.03 | 4 | 0.03 |
| | | Random Inspections | | 3.35 | 3 | 0.35 | 3 | 0.35 | 3 | 0.35 |
| | | Periodic Performance Assessment | | 3.81 | 1 | 2.81 | 3 | 0.81 | 5 | 1.19 |
| | Move Management | Pre-move counseling | | 4.15 | 3 | 1.15 | 5 | 0.85 | 3 | 1.15 |
| | | Single point of contact move management | | 4.39 | 1 | 3.39 | 5 | 0.61 | 1 | 3.39 |
| | | Binding estimates for excess costs | | 3.69 | 1 | 2.69 | 4 | 0.31 | 2 | 1.69 |
| | | Destination information | | 3.43 | 1 | 2.43 | 4 | 0.57 | 1 | 2.43 |
| | | Shipment tracking | | 4.27 | 3 | 1.27 | 5 | 0.73 | 4 | 0.27 |
| Develop and Maintain a Competitive Market | | Delivery coordination | | 4.45 | 5 | 0.55 | 3 | 1.45 | 2 | 2.45 |
| | | Real Estate assistance | | 2.56 | 1 | 1.56 | 4 | 1.44 | 1 | 1.56 |
| | Pricing Strategy | Current DOD solicitation process | Domestic | 1.58 | 1 | 0.58 | 1 | 0.58 | 1 | 0.58 |
| | | | International | 1.58 | 1 | 0.58 | 1 | 0.58 | 1 | 0.58 |
| | | Commercial Tariff | Domestic | 3.75 | 5 | 1.25 | 5 | 1.25 | 1 | 2.75 |
| | | GSA Tender 1-W | Domestic | 2.52 | 1 | 1.52 | 1 | 1.52 | 1 | 1.52 |
| | | | International | 2.52 | 1 | 1.52 | 1 | 1.52 | 1 | 1.52 |
| | | Single-Factor-Rate | Domestic | 3.05 | 1 | 2.05 | 1 | 2.05 | 1 | 2.05 |
| | | | International | 3.68 | 1 | 2.68 | 5 | 1.32 | 1 | 2.68 |
| | | Commissions for move manager | | 2.66 | 1 | 1.66 | 3 | 0.34 | 1 | 1.66 |
| EDL capability required | Traffic Allocation | Contract consolidation | | 3.44 | 1 | 2.44 | 5 | 1.56 | 4 | 0.56 |
| | | Traffic distribution based solely on quality | | 3.81 | 4 | 0.19 | 4 | 0.19 | 3 | 0.81 |
| | | Traffic distribution performed by: | Move Manager | 3.13 | 1 | 2.13 | 5 | 1.87 | 1 | 2.13 |
| | | | Service member | 3.46 | 4 | 0.54 | 1 | 2.46 | 1 | 2.46 |
| | | | Government | 2.77 | 2 | 0.77 | 1 | 1.77 | 5 | 2.23 |
| | | Elimination of the Traffic Distribution Record | | 4.16 | 3 | 1.16 | 5 | 0.84 | 3 | 1.16 |
| | | Reduction in Contracts awarded | | 3.30 | 1 | 2.30 | 5 | 1.70 | 3 | 0.30 |
| | | Increase length of Contract award | | 3.70 | 1 | 2.70 | 4 | 0.30 | 4 | 0.30 |
| | | Reduction movement and storage categories | | 3.99 | 1 | 2.99 | 3 | 0.99 | 5 | 1.01 |
| | Service Structure | Change current structure of AOR to RA | | 3.00 | 3 | 0.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| SBA Compliance Means | Traffic Structure | DFAS | | 3.69 | 1 | 2.69 | 3 | 0.69 | 4 | 0.31 |
| | Payment | Bank Service Contract | | 2.12 | 1 | 1.12 | 1 | 1.12 | 5 | 2.88 |
| | | Government Credit Card | | 3.69 | 1 | 2.69 | 5 | 1.31 | 1 | 2.69 |
| | | Application of Small Business Act | | 3.49 | 5 | 1.51 | 1 | 2.49 | 1 | 2.49 |
| | | Small Business prime contractor set asides | | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | | | 2.46 | 5 | 2.54 | 1 | 1.46 | 1 | 1.46 |
| | | | | | | 68.95 | | 48.32 | | 63.33 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

(2 government)

| Goal | Sub-goal | Criteria | Sub-criteria | Value | SAI | Difference | FSMP | Difference | NTAC | Difference |
|---|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|-----|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| Improve Quality of Life | Contracting Method | FAR - based | | 3.33 | 3 | 0.33 | 4 | 0.67 | 5 | 1.67 |
| | Loss and Damage Claim | Full Replacement | | 4.86 | 5 | 0.14 | 5 | 0.14 | 4 | 0.86 |
| | | Direct Claim Settlement | Move Manager | 3.71 | 1 | 2.71 | 5 | 1.29 | 1 | 2.71 |
| | | | Transportation Provider | 4.14 | 5 | 0.86 | 1 | 3.14 | 4 | 0.14 |
| | | | Government | 2.29 | 2 | 0.29 | 1 | 1.29 | 3 | 0.71 |
| | | Reduced claim preparation requirements | | 4.57 | 2 | 2.57 | 4 | 0.57 | 4 | 0.57 |
| | | Reduced claim settlement period | | 4.43 | 4 | 0.43 | 5 | 0.57 | 3 | 1.43 |
| | Provider Qualification | Financial stability | | 4.14 | 2 | 2.14 | 4 | 0.14 | 3 | 1.14 |
| | | Ensured capacity | | 4.14 | 1 | 3.14 | 4 | 0.14 | 4 | 0.14 |
| | | Past performance | | 4.14 | 4 | 0.14 | 5 | 0.86 | 3 | 1.14 |
| Provider Performance Measurement | | Inclusion of Service Contract Act | | 3.33 | 4 | 0.67 | 1 | 2.33 | 1 | 2.33 |
| | | Inconvenience payments | | 3.71 | 4 | 0.29 | 4 | 0.29 | 4 | 0.29 |
| | | Customer Surveys | | 4.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Random Inspections | | 3.14 | 3 | 0.14 | 3 | 0.14 | 3 | 0.14 |
| | | Periodic Performance Assessment | | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 |
| | | Pre-move counseling | | 4.71 | 3 | 1.71 | 5 | 0.29 | 3 | 1.71 |
| | Move Management | Single point of contact move management | | 4.43 | 1 | 3.43 | 5 | 0.57 | 1 | 3.43 |
| | | Binding estimates for excess costs | | 4.33 | 1 | 3.33 | 4 | 0.33 | 2 | 2.33 |
| | | Destination information | | 3.29 | 1 | 2.29 | 4 | 0.71 | 1 | 2.29 |
| | | Shipment tracking | | 4.14 | 3 | 1.14 | 5 | 0.86 | 4 | 0.14 |
| Pricing Strategy | | Delivery coordination | | 4.43 | 5 | 0.57 | 3 | 1.43 | 2 | 2.43 |
| | | Real Estate assistance | | 2.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 4 | 2.00 | 1 | 1.00 |
| | | Current DOD solicitation process | | 1.57 | 1 | 0.57 | 1 | 0.57 | 1 | 0.57 |
| | | | Domestic | 1.57 | 1 | 0.57 | 1 | 0.57 | 1 | 0.57 |
| | | | International | 1.57 | 1 | 0.57 | 1 | 0.57 | 1 | 0.57 |
| | | | Domestic | 3.57 | 5 | 1.43 | 5 | 1.43 | 1 | 2.57 |
| | | | Domestic | 2.57 | 1 | 1.57 | 1 | 1.57 | 1 | 1.57 |
| | | | International | 2.57 | 1 | 1.57 | 1 | 1.57 | 1 | 1.57 |
| | | | Domestic | 3.14 | 1 | 2.14 | 1 | 2.14 | 1 | 2.14 |
| | | | International | 3.71 | 1 | 2.71 | 5 | 1.29 | 1 | 2.71 |
| Traffic Allocation | | Commissions for move manager | | 2.57 | 1 | 1.57 | 3 | 0.43 | 1 | 1.57 |
| | | Contract consolidation | | 3.57 | 1 | 2.57 | 5 | 1.43 | 4 | 0.43 |
| | | Traffic distribution based solely on quality | | 3.43 | 4 | 0.57 | 4 | 0.57 | 3 | 0.43 |
| | | Traffic distribution performed by: | | 3.71 | 1 | 2.71 | 5 | 1.29 | 1 | 2.71 |
| | | | Move Manager | 2.71 | 4 | 1.29 | 1 | 1.71 | 1 | 1.71 |
| | | | Servicemember | 3.14 | 2 | 1.14 | 1 | 2.14 | 5 | 1.86 |
| | | | Government | 4.67 | 3 | 1.67 | 5 | 0.33 | 3 | 1.67 |
| | | Elimination of the Traffic Distribution Record | | 3.14 | 1 | 2.14 | 5 | 1.86 | 3 | 0.14 |
| | | Reduction in Contracts awarded | | 3.86 | 1 | 2.86 | 4 | 0.14 | 4 | 0.14 |
| | | Increase length of Contract award | | 4.57 | 1 | 3.57 | 3 | 1.57 | 5 | 0.43 |
| Develop and Maintain a Competitive Market | EDI capability required | Reduction movement and storage categories | | 3.57 | 1 | 2.57 | 3 | 0.57 | 4 | 0.43 |
| | Service Structure | Change current structure of AOR to RA | | 1.86 | 1 | 0.86 | 1 | 0.86 | 5 | 3.14 |
| | Traffic Structure | DFAS | | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 1 | 3.00 |
| | Payment | Bank Service Contract | | 3.71 | 5 | 1.29 | 1 | 2.71 | 1 | 2.71 |
| | | Government Credit Card | | 3.71 | 5 | 1.29 | 1 | 2.71 | 1 | 2.71 |
| | | Application of Small Business Act | | 3.57 | 4 | 0.43 | 4 | 0.43 | 4 | 0.43 |
| | SBA Compliance Means | Small Business prime contractor set asides | | 2.71 | 5 | 2.29 | 1 | 1.71 | 1 | 1.71 |
| | | | | 2.71 | 5 | 2.29 | 1 | 1.71 | 1 | 1.71 |
| | | | | 2.71 | 5 | 2.29 | 1 | 1.71 | 1 | 1.71 |
| | | | | 2.71 | 5 | 2.29 | 1 | 1.71 | 1 | 1.71 |

(3 transportation providers)

| Goal | Sub-goal | Criteria | Sub-criteria | Value | SAM | Difference | ESMP | Difference | MTMC | Difference |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|-----|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| Improve Quality of Life | Contracting Method | FAR-based | | 1.00 | 3 | 2.00 | 4 | 3.00 | 5 | 4.00 |
| | Loss and Damage Claim | Full Replacement | | 4.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Direct Claim Settlement | Move Manager | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 5 | 4.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| | | | Transportation Provider | 5.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| | | | Government | 1.00 | 2 | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | | Reduced claim preparation requirements | | 4.00 | 2 | 2.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Reduced claim settlement period | | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 5 | 1.50 | 3 | 0.50 |
| | Provider Qualification | Financial stability | | 4.00 | 2 | 2.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 3 | 1.00 |
| | | Ensured capacity | | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | Past performance | | 4.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 3 | 1.00 |
| | | Inclusion of Service Contract Act | | 1.50 | 4 | 2.50 | 1 | 0.50 | 1 | 0.50 |
| | | Inconvenience payments | | 3.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| | Provider Performance Measurement | Customer Surveys | | 4.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Random Inspections | | 4.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 3 | 1.00 |
| | | Periodic Performance Assessment | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 3 | 0.50 | 5 | 1.50 |
| | Move Management | Pre-move counseling | | 4.50 | 3 | 1.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 3 | 1.50 |
| | | Single point of contact move management | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 5 | 1.50 | 1 | 2.50 |
| | | Binding estimates for excess costs | | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 2 | 1.00 |
| | | Destination information | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 1 | 2.50 |
| | | Shipment tracking | | 3.50 | 3 | 0.50 | 5 | 1.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | Delivery coordination | | 4.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 3 | 1.50 | 2 | 2.50 |
| | | Real Estate assistance | | 1.50 | 1 | 0.50 | 4 | 2.50 | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Pricing Strategy | Current DOD solicitation process | Domestic | 2.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 |
| | | | International | 2.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 |
| | | Commercial Tariff | Domestic | 3.00 | 5 | 2.00 | 5 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | GSA Tender 1-W | Domestic | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | | International | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | Single-Factor-Rate | Domestic | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | | International | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 1 | 3.50 |
| | | Commissions for move manager | | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| Reduce Total Cost | Traffic Allocation | Contract consolidation | | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 5 | 4.00 | 4 | 3.00 |
| | | Traffic distribution based solely on quality | | 4.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 3 | 1.50 |
| | | Traffic distribution performed by: | Move Manager | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 5 | 4.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| | | | Service member | 4.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 1 | 3.00 |
| | | | Government | 4.00 | 2 | 2.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 5 | 1.00 |
| | | Elimination of the Traffic Distribution Record | | 3.00 | 3 | 0.00 | 5 | 2.00 | 3 | 0.00 |
| | | Reduction in Contracts awarded | | 1.50 | 1 | 0.50 | 5 | 3.50 | 3 | 1.50 |
| | | Increase length of contract award | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | EDI capability required | | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 3 | 0.50 | 5 | 1.50 |
| | Service Structure | Reduction movement and storage categories | | 3.50 | 3 | 0.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 1 | 2.50 |
| Develop and Maintain a Competitive Market | Traffic Structure | Change current structure of AOR to RA | | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | Payment | DFAS | | 2.50 | 1 | 1.50 | 1 | 1.50 | 5 | 2.50 |
| | | Bank Service Contract | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 5 | 1.50 | 1 | 2.50 |
| | | Government Credit Card | | 4.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 1 | 3.00 |
| | | Application of Small Business Act | | 4.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | SBA Compliance Means | Small Business prime contractor set asides | | 5.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 1 | 4.00 |
| | | | | | | 50.50 | | 74.50 | | 55.50 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

(4 relocation managers)

| Goal | Sub-goal | Criteria | Sub-criteria | Value | \$AM | Difference | \$MIP | Difference | MIP/C | Difference |
|---|------------------------|--|----------------|-------|------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|
| Improve Quality of Life | Contracting Method | FAR-based | | 4.50 | 3 | 1.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 5 | 0.50 |
| | Loss and Damage Claim | Full Replacement | | 5.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| | | Direct Claim Settlement | Move Manager | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 4.00 |
| | | | Government | 2.00 | 5 | 3.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 4 | 2.00 |
| | | Reduced claim preparation requirements | | 1.00 | 2 | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | | Reduced claim settlement period | | 5.00 | 2 | 3.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| | | Financial stability | | 5.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | Provider Qualification | Ensured capacity | | 4.50 | 2 | 2.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 3 | 1.50 |
| | | Past performance | | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| | | Inclusion of Service Contract Act | | 4.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 3 | 1.00 |
| Provider Performance Measurement | | Inconvenience payments | | 1.00 | 4 | 3.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| | | Customer Surveys | | 4.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Random Inspections | | 4.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Periodic Performance Assessment | | 2.50 | 3 | 0.50 | 3 | 0.50 | 3 | 0.50 |
| | | Pre-move counseling | | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 |
| | Move Management | Single point of contact move management | | 5.00 | 3 | 2.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | | Binding estimates for excess costs | | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 4.00 |
| | | Destination information | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 2 | 1.50 |
| | | Shipment tracking | | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 1 | 3.50 |
| | | Delivery coordination | | 4.50 | 3 | 1.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| Pricing Strategy | | Real Estate assistance | | 5.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 | 2 | 3.00 |
| | | Current DOD solicitation process | | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 1 | 3.50 |
| | | | Domestic | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| | | | International | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| | | | Domestic | 5.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 4.00 |
| | | | Domestic | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| | | | International | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| | | | Domestic | 2.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 |
| | | | International | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 5 | 1.50 | 1 | 2.50 |
| | | | International | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 3 | 2.00 | 1 | 4.00 |
| Traffic Allocation | | Commissions for move manager | | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | Contract consolidation | | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 3 | 0.50 |
| | | Traffic distribution based solely on quality | | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 4.00 |
| | | Traffic distribution performed by: | | 3.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | | Move Manager | 1.00 | 2 | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 5 | 4.00 |
| | | | Service member | 5.00 | 3 | 2.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | | | Government | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | | Elimination of the Traffic Distribution Record | | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | | Reduction in Contracts awarded | | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | | Increase length of Contract award | | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| EDI capability required Service Structure | | Reduction movement and storage categories | | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 3 | 1.50 | 5 | 0.50 |
| | | Change current structure of AOR to RA | | 2.50 | 3 | 0.50 | 1 | 1.50 | 1 | 1.50 |
| | | DFAS | | 5.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 3 | 2.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| | | Bank Service Contract | | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 5 | 4.00 |
| | | Government Credit Card | | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 1 | 3.00 |
| | | Application of Small Business Act | | 3.50 | 5 | 1.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 1 | 2.50 |
| | | Small Business prime contractor set asides | | 4.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | | | 1.00 | 5 | 4.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 35.00 | | 23.00 | | 75.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| Goal | Sub-goal | Criteria | Sub-criteria | Value | SAM | Difference | FSME | Difference | NTMC | Difference |
|------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|-----|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| | Contracting Method | FAR-based | | 2.75 | 3 | 0.25 | 4 | 1.25 | 5 | 2.25 |
| | Loss and Damage Claim | Full Replacement | | 4.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | Direct Claim Settlement | Move Manager | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 5 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | | Transportation Provider | 3.50 | 5 | 1.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | | Government | 1.00 | 2 | 1.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.00 |
| | | Reduced claim preparation requirements | | 4.50 | 2 | 2.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | Reduced claim settlement period | | 4.25 | 4 | 0.25 | 5 | 0.75 | 3 | 1.25 |
| | | Financial stability | | 4.25 | 2 | 2.25 | 4 | 0.25 | 3 | 1.25 |
| | Provider Qualification | Ensured capacity | | 3.75 | 1 | 2.75 | 4 | 0.25 | 4 | 0.25 |
| | | Past performance | | 4.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 3 | 1.00 |
| | | Inclusion of Service Contract Act | | 1.25 | 4 | 2.75 | 1 | 0.25 | 1 | 0.25 |
| | | Inconvenience payments | | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | Customer Surveys | | 4.25 | 5 | 0.75 | 4 | 0.25 | 4 | 0.25 |
| | Provider Performance Measurement | Random Inspections | | 3.25 | 3 | 0.25 | 3 | 0.25 | 3 | 0.25 |
| | | Periodic Performance Assessment | | 3.75 | 1 | 2.75 | 3 | 0.75 | 5 | 1.25 |
| | | Pre-move counseling | | 4.75 | 3 | 1.75 | 5 | 0.25 | 3 | 1.75 |
| | Move Management | Single point of contact move management | | 4.25 | 1 | 3.25 | 5 | 0.75 | 1 | 3.25 |
| | | Binding estimates for excess costs | | 3.25 | 1 | 2.25 | 4 | 0.75 | 2 | 1.25 |
| | | Destination information | | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 1 | 3.00 |
| | | Shipment tracking | | 4.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Delivery coordination | | 4.75 | 5 | 0.25 | 3 | 1.75 | 2 | 2.75 |
| | | Real Estate assistance | | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | Pricing Strategy | Current DOD solicitation process | Domestic | 1.50 | 1 | 0.50 | 1 | 0.50 | 1 | 0.50 |
| | | | International | 1.50 | 1 | 0.50 | 1 | 0.50 | 1 | 0.50 |
| | | Commercial Tariff | Domestic | 4.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 1 | 3.00 |
| | | GSA Tender 1-W | Domestic | 2.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 |
| | | | International | 2.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 |
| | | Single-Factor-Rate | Domestic | 2.67 | 1 | 1.67 | 1 | 1.67 | 1 | 1.67 |
| | | | International | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 1 | 3.00 |
| | | Commissions for move manager | | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 3 | 0.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | Contract consolidation | | 2.75 | 1 | 1.75 | 5 | 2.25 | 4 | 1.25 |
| | Traffic Allocation | Traffic distribution based solely on quality | | 4.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 3 | 1.00 |
| | | Traffic distribution performed by: | Move Manager | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 5 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | | Service member | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 1 | 2.50 |
| | | | Government | 2.50 | 2 | 0.50 | 1 | 1.50 | 5 | 2.50 |
| | | Elimination of the Traffic Distribution Record | | 4.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 3 | 1.00 |
| | | Reduction in Contracts awarded | | 3.25 | 1 | 2.25 | 5 | 1.75 | 3 | 0.25 |
| | | Increase length of Contract award | | 4.25 | 1 | 3.25 | 4 | 0.25 | 4 | 0.25 |
| | | | | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 |
| | EDI capability required | Reduction movement and storage categories | | 3.00 | 3 | 0.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | Service Structure | Change current structure of AOR to RA | | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 3 | 1.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | Traffic Structure | DFAS | | 1.75 | 1 | 0.75 | 1 | 0.75 | 5 | 3.25 |
| | Payment | Bank Service Contract | | 3.75 | 1 | 2.75 | 5 | 1.25 | 1 | 2.75 |
| | | Government Credit Card | | 3.75 | 5 | 1.25 | 1 | 2.75 | 1 | 2.75 |
| | | Application of Small Business Act | | 4.25 | 4 | 0.25 | 4 | 0.25 | 4 | 0.25 |
| | SBA Compliance Means | Small Business prime contractor set asides | | 2.33 | 5 | 2.67 | 1 | 1.33 | 1 | 1.33 |
| | | | | | | 69.59 | | 41.38 | | 18.25 |

(6 servicemember)

| Goal | Sub-goal | Criteria | Sub-criteria | Value | SAM | Difference | ESMP | Difference | MTMC | Difference |
|---|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|-----|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| Improve Quality of Life | Contracting Method | FAR-based | | 3.00 | 3 | 0.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 5 | 2.00 |
| | Loss and Damage Claim | Full Replacement | | 4.83 | 5 | 0.17 | 5 | 0.17 | 4 | 0.83 |
| | | Direct Claim Settlement | Move Manager | 2.17 | 1 | 1.17 | 5 | 2.83 | 1 | 1.17 |
| | | | Transportation Provider | 3.33 | 5 | 1.67 | 1 | 2.33 | 4 | 0.67 |
| | | | Government | 3.00 | 2 | 1.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 3 | 0.00 |
| | | Reduced claim preparation requirements | | 4.00 | 2 | 2.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Reduced claim settlement period | | 4.67 | 4 | 0.67 | 5 | 0.33 | 3 | 1.67 |
| | Provider Qualification | Financial stability | | 3.50 | 2 | 1.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 3 | 0.50 |
| | | Ensured capacity | | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.50 |
| | | Past performance | | 4.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 3 | 1.50 |
| Provider Performance Measurement | | Inclusion of Service Contract Act | | 3.20 | 4 | 0.80 | 1 | 2.20 | 1 | 2.20 |
| | | Inconvenience payments | | 3.40 | 4 | 0.60 | 4 | 0.60 | 4 | 0.60 |
| | | Customer Surveys | | 3.83 | 5 | 1.17 | 4 | 0.17 | 4 | 0.17 |
| | | Random Inspections | | 3.67 | 3 | 0.67 | 3 | 0.67 | 3 | 0.67 |
| | | Periodic Performance Assessment | | 3.67 | 1 | 2.67 | 3 | 0.67 | 5 | 1.33 |
| | Move Management | Pre-move counseling | | 3.00 | 3 | 0.00 | 5 | 2.00 | 3 | 0.00 |
| | | Single point of contact move management | | 4.50 | 1 | 3.50 | 5 | 0.50 | 1 | 3.50 |
| | | Binding estimates for excess costs | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 4 | 0.50 | 2 | 1.50 |
| | | Destination information | | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | Shipment tracking | | 4.67 | 3 | 1.67 | 5 | 0.33 | 4 | 0.67 |
| Pricing Strategy | | Delivery coordination | | 4.17 | 5 | 0.83 | 3 | 1.17 | 2 | 2.17 |
| | | Real Estate assistance | | 2.67 | 1 | 1.67 | 4 | 1.33 | 1 | 1.67 |
| | | Current DOD solicitation process | Domestic | 1.67 | 1 | 0.67 | 1 | 0.67 | 1 | 0.67 |
| | | | International | 1.67 | 1 | 0.67 | 1 | 0.67 | 1 | 0.67 |
| | | Commercial Tariff | Domestic | 3.67 | 5 | 1.33 | 5 | 1.33 | 1 | 2.67 |
| | | GSA Tender 1-W | Domestic | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | | International | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| | | Single-Factor-Rate | Domestic | 3.33 | 1 | 2.33 | 1 | 2.33 | 1 | 2.33 |
| | | | International | 3.33 | 1 | 2.33 | 5 | 1.67 | 1 | 2.33 |
| | | Commissions for move manager | | 2.40 | 1 | 1.40 | 3 | 0.60 | 1 | 1.40 |
| Traffic Allocation | | Contract consolidation | | 4.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| | | Traffic distribution based solely on quality | | 4.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 3 | 1.00 |
| | | Traffic distribution performed by: | Move Manager | 2.67 | 1 | 1.67 | 5 | 2.33 | 1 | 1.67 |
| | | | Servicemember | 4.17 | 4 | 0.17 | 1 | 3.17 | 1 | 3.17 |
| | | | Government | 2.67 | 2 | 0.67 | 1 | 1.67 | 5 | 2.33 |
| | | Elimination of the Traffic Distribution Record | | 3.80 | 3 | 0.80 | 5 | 1.20 | 3 | 0.80 |
| | | Reduction in Contracts awarded | | 3.50 | 1 | 2.50 | 5 | 1.50 | 3 | 0.50 |
| | | Increase length of Contract award | | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 4 | 1.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| | EDI capability required | Reduction movement and storage categories | | 3.40 | 1 | 2.40 | 3 | 0.40 | 5 | 1.60 |
| | Service Structure | Change current structure of AOR to RA | | 3.00 | 3 | 0.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 1 | 2.00 |
| Develop and Maintain a Competitive Market | Traffic Structure | DFAS | | 3.00 | 1 | 2.00 | 3 | 0.00 | 4 | 1.00 |
| | Payment | Bank Service Contract | | 2.75 | 1 | 1.75 | 1 | 1.75 | 5 | 2.25 |
| | | Government Credit Card | | 3.33 | 1 | 2.33 | 5 | 1.67 | 1 | 2.33 |
| | | Application of Small Business Act | | 4.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 1 | 3.00 | 1 | 3.00 |
| | SBA Compliance Means | Small Business prime contractor set asides | | 2.67 | 4 | 1.33 | 4 | 1.33 | 4 | 1.33 |
| | | | | 2.33 | 5 | 2.67 | 1 | 1.33 | 1 | 1.33 |
| | | | | | | 67.38 | | 81.92 | | 84.70 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

(7 analysis)

| Stakeholder Group | Aggregate Total Difference | | | Government Total Difference | | | Providers Total Difference | | | Relocation Total Difference | | | Industry Total Difference | | | Service members Total Difference | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | SAM | FSMP | MTMC | SAM | FSMP | MTMC | SAM | FSMP | MTMC | SAM | FSMP | MTMC | SAM | FSMP | MTMC | SAM | FSMP | MTMC |
| Contracting Method | 0.03 | 0.97 | 1.97 | 0.33 | 0.67 | 1.67 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 1.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 1.25 | 2.25 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Loss and Damage Claim | 6.48 | 6.98 | 5.74 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 6.42 | 4.50 | 10.50 | 3.50 | 12.00 | 2.00 | 12.00 | 7.75 | 6.25 | 6.75 | 6.68 | 7.66 | 4.34 |
| Provider Qualification | 7.17 | 3.01 | 4.35 | 6.36 | 3.76 | 5.04 | 9.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 7.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 8.25 | 2.25 | 3.25 | 6.90 | 4.30 | 5.30 |
| Performance Measures | 4.13 | 1.19 | 1.57 | 4.14 | 1.14 | 1.14 | 4.50 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.75 | 1.25 | 1.75 | 4.51 | 1.51 | 2.17 |
| Movement Management | 13.04 | 5.96 | 12.94 | 13.47 | 6.19 | 13.33 | 10.00 | 9.00 | 11.00 | 17.00 | 4.00 | 18.00 | 13.50 | 5.50 | 14.00 | 12.17 | 6.83 | 11.51 |
| Improve Quality of Life | 30.85 | 18.11 | 26.57 | 31.32 | 18.76 | 27.60 | 30.00 | 27.00 | 25.00 | 42.00 | 11.00 | 36.00 | 33.50 | 16.50 | 28.00 | 30.26 | 21.30 | 25.32 |
| Price Strategy | 11.84 | 9.16 | 13.34 | 12.13 | 9.57 | 13.27 | 13.50 | 12.50 | 13.50 | 7.50 | 4.50 | 11.50 | 10.67 | 6.67 | 12.67 | 12.73 | 11.27 | 14.07 |
| Traffic Allocation | 12.23 | 10.69 | 9.95 | 14.95 | 9.47 | 9.09 | 5.50 | 20.50 | 10.50 | 20.00 | 4.00 | 16.00 | 11.25 | 11.25 | 10.75 | 10.81 | 11.87 | 10.47 |
| EDI Capability | 2.99 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 3.57 | 1.57 | 0.43 | 2.50 | 0.50 | 1.50 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 0.50 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.40 | 0.40 | 1.60 |
| Category & Service Structure | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 0.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Reduce Total Cost | 27.06 | 22.84 | 26.30 | 30.65 | 22.61 | 24.79 | 22.00 | 36.00 | 28.00 | 31.50 | 11.50 | 29.50 | 24.92 | 20.92 | 26.42 | 25.94 | 25.54 | 28.14 |
| Traffic Structure | 2.69 | 0.69 | 0.31 | 2.57 | 0.57 | 0.43 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 0.50 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Payment Options | 5.32 | 4.92 | 8.06 | 5.15 | 4.57 | 8.85 | 5.00 | 6.00 | 8.00 | 4.50 | 3.50 | 9.50 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 8.75 | 5.08 | 6.42 | 7.98 |
| SBA Compliance | 3.04 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 2.72 | 2.14 | 2.14 | 0.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.92 | 1.58 | 1.58 | 4.00 | 2.66 | 2.66 |
| Maintain a Competitive Market | 11.05 | 7.57 | 10.33 | 10.44 | 7.28 | 11.42 | 8.50 | 11.50 | 12.50 | 12.50 | 5.50 | 10.50 | 11.17 | 7.83 | 10.83 | 11.08 | 9.08 | 11.24 |
| TOTAL | 68.96 | 48.52 | 63.20 | 72.41 | 48.65 | 63.81 | 60.50 | 74.50 | 65.50 | 86.00 | 28.00 | 76.00 | 69.59 | 45.25 | 65.25 | 67.28 | 55.92 | 64.70 |

LISTS OF REFERENCES

Books:

Beyer, Alfred H. and Lawrence Schwartz. Targeting Best Value in Personal Property Procurement. Bethesda, Maryland: Logistics Management Institute, 1993.

Bonser, Charles F., Eugene B. McGregor, Jr. and Clinton V. Oster, Jr. Policy Choices and Public Action. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1996.

Bryson, John M. Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995.

Fischer, Frank and John Forester, ed. Confronting Values in Policy Analysis: The Politics of Criteria, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1987.

Freeman, R. E. Strategic Management: A Stakeholders Approach. Boston: Pitman, 1984.

Levin, David M., Berenson, Mark L. and Stephan, David. Statistics for Managers. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1998.

Mitroff, Ian I. Stakeholders of the Organizational Mind. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Nagel, Stuart S., ed. Policy Theory and Policy Evaluation. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Roberts, Nancy and Paula J. King. Transforming Public Policy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996.

Rossi, Peter H. and Howard E. Freeman. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. London: Sage Publications, 1989.

Smith, P., ed. Measuring Outcome in the Public Sector. Taylor & Francis Publishers, 1996.

Walker, Warren E. and Gene H. Fisher. Public Policy Analysis: A Brief Definition. Santa Monica: RAND Publications, 1994.

Weimer, David L. and Aidan R. Vining. Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Apprentice Hall, 1992.

Journals:

Roberts, Nancy and Paula J. King. "Organizational Dynamics: The Stakeholder Audit Goes Public." American Management Association (1989).

Moore, Robert H. "Statements before the House Committee on Small Business, October 11, 1995." Defense Issues, Volume 10, Number 110.

Government Documents:

Cohen, William S., Secretary of Defense. Defense Initiative Report. Washington, D.C., November 1997.

General Accounting Office (GAO). Household Goods: Competition Among Commercial Movers Serving DOD Can Be Improve GAO/NSIAD-90-50 (February 1990).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: Commercial Practices Offer Improvement Opportunities GAO/NSIAD-94-26 (November 1993).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: Reengineering the DOD Personal Property Program GAO/NSIAD-97-49 (November 1996).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: Efforts to Improve DOD's Personal Property Program GAO/NSIAD-99-106 (March 1999).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: Plan Needed for Evaluating the Navy Personal Property Pilot GAO/NSIAD-99-138 (June 1999).

Military Traffic Management Command. "Information Paper for Brigadier General Privratsky." June 3 1999.

Office of the Secretary of Defense. "Personal Property Program Management Reform Memorandum #6." 1999.

Office of the Secretary of Defense. "Full Service Moving Project." February 12, 1999.

United States Transportation Command. "Evaluation Support for DOD's Personal Property Reengineering Programs Statement of Work." 1999.

United States Transportation Command. "Evaluation Plan for Reengineered DOD Personal Property Pilot Program, Service Member-Arranged Move, and DOD Full Service Moving Project." February 4, 1999.

Congressional Testimony:

Coburn, John G., Lieutenant General, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Groover, Jr., L. Clyde, Chairman of the Military Mobility Coalition. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Harrison, Joe, President of the AMSA. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Head, Terry, President of the HGFA. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Kallock, Roger W., Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics). Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Thompson, Roger G., Lieutenant General, Commander in Chief, United States Transportation Command. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Warren, David R., Director, Defense Management Issues, General Accounting Office. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Interviews:

Interview with Robin Baldwin, Contracting Officer, Full Service Moving Project by electronic correspondence, and author on August 18, 1999.

Interview with Larry N. Campbell, United States Transportation Command by electronic correspondence, and author on August 20, 1999.

Interview with Richard G. Klien, Project Manager, Service-Member Arranged Move by electronic correspondence, and author on August 16, 1999.

Interview with Lisa Roberts, Deputy Project Manager, Full Service Moving Project by electronic correspondence, and author, on August 30, 1999.

Interview with Anne Statland, Deputy Project Manager, Military Traffic Management Command Pilot by electronic correspondence, and author on August 16, 1999.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

- Beyer, Alfred H. and James E. Cotterman. MTMC's Approach to Reengineering DOD's Personal Property Business Process. McLean, Virginia: Logistics Management Institute, 1996.
- Beyer, Alfred H. and Lawrence Schwartz. Targeting Best Value in Personal Property Procurement. Bethesda, Maryland: Logistics Management Institute, 1993.
- Bonser, Charles F., Eugene B. McGregor, Jr. and Clinton V. Oster, Jr. Policy Choices and Public Action. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1996.
- Bryson, John M. Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995.
- Dery, David. Problem Definition in Policy Analysis. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1984.
- Dutton, Jane E. "Strategic Agenda Building in Organizations" in Organizational Decision Making. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1997.
- Fischer, Frank and John Forester, ed. Confronting Values in Policy Analysis: The Politics of Criteria. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1987.
- Freeman, R. E. Strategic Management: A Stakeholders Approach. Boston: Pitman, 1984.
- Gardner, James R., Robert Rachlin and H.W. Allen Sweeny, eds. Handbook for Strategic Planning. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1986.
- Hall, Richard H. and Robert E. Quinn, eds. Organizational Theory and Public Policy. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1983.
- Levin, David M., Berenson, Mark L. and Stephan, David. Statistics for Managers. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1998.

- Mason, Richard O. and Ian I. Mitroff. Challenging Strategic Planning Assumptions. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981.
- Mitroff, Ian I. Stakeholders of the Organizational Mind. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.
- Moore, Mark H. Creating Public Value. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Nagel, Stuart S., ed. Policy Theory and Policy Evaluation. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.
- Nutt, Paul C. and Robert W. Backoff. Strategic Management of Public and Third Sector Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1992.
- Posavac, Emil J. and Raymond G. Carey. Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1989.
- Roberts, Nancy. Limitations of Strategic Action in Bureaus: The Case of the Department of Defense. Monterey: Naval Postgraduate School, 1990.
- Roberts, Nancy and Paula J. King. Transforming Public Policy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996.
- Rossi, Peter H. and Howard E. Freeman. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. London: Sage Publications, 1989.
- Saaty, Thomas L. Decision Making for Leaders. Pittsburgh: RWS Publications, 1990.
- Smith, P., ed. Measuring Outcome in the Public Sector. Taylor & Francis Publishers, 1996.
- Stokey, Edith and Richard Zeckhauser. A Primer for Policy Analysis. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1978.
- Walker, Warren E. and Gene H. Fisher. Public Policy Analysis: A Brief Definition. Santa Monica, California: RAND Publications, 1994.
- Weimer, David L. and Aidan R. Vining. Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1992.

Journals:

Deavenport, Earnie. "Walking the High Wire: Balancing Stakeholder Interests." Executive Speeches (Feb/Mar 19996).

Epstein, Marc J. and Jean-Francois Manzoni. "The Balance Scorecard and Tableau de Bord: Translating Strategy into Action." Management Accounting (August 1997).

Froman, Jeff. "Stakeholder Influence Strategies." Academy of Management (April 1999).

Harrison, Jeffrey S. and Caron H. St. John. "Managing and Partnering with External Stakeholders." Academy of Management Executive, Volume 10 No. 2 (1996).

Jones, Thomas M. and Andrew C. Wicks. "Convergent Stakeholder Theory." Academy of Management (April 1999)

Moore, Robert H. "Statements before the House Committee on Small Business, October 11, 1995." Defense Issues, Volume 10, Number 110.

Roberts, Nancy and Paula J. King. "Organizational Dynamics: The Stakeholder Audit Goes Public." American Management Association (1989).

Government Documents:

Calhoun, Todd. Evaluating Security Assistance Program: Performance Evaluations and the Expanded International Military Education and Training (E-IMET) Program. Monterey: Naval Postgraduate School, 1998.

Cohen, William S., Secretary of Defense. Defense Initiative Report. Washington, D.C., November 1997.

Daugherty, Paul, Lieutenant Commander. "Personal Property Program Initiatives." Presentation to the Vice-Chief of Naval Operations, June 1999.

Department of the Navy. "Service Member Arrange Move Program Lessons Learned."

Department of the Navy. "Summary of Service-Member Arranged Move (SAM) Program Features Compares To Proposal Summary For The Commercial-Like Assurance Of Superior Service (CLASS) Program."

General Accounting Office (GAO). Household Goods: Competition Among Commercial Movers Serving DOD Can Be Improve GAO/NSIAD-90-50 (February 1990).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Using Structured Interviewing Techniques. GAO/PEMD-10.1.5 (July 1991).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: Commercial Practices Offer Improvement Opportunities GAO/NSIAD-94-26 (November 1993).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Household Goods: Administrative Changes Would Improve DOD's Do-It-Yourself Moving Program GAO/NSIAD-94-226 (September 1994).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: Reengineering the DOD Personal Property Program GAO/NSIAD-97-49 (November 1996).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: Efforts to Improve DOD's Personal Property Program GAO/NSIAD-99-106 (March 1999).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: The Army's Hunter Pilot Project is Inconclusive but Provides Lessons Learned GAO/NSIAD-99-129 (June 1999).

General Accounting Office (GAO). Defense Transportation: Plan Needed for Evaluating the Navy Personal Property Pilot GAO/NSIAD-99-138 (June 1999).

Military Traffic Management Command. "1st Quarterly Personal Property Pilot Contractors' Meeting Minutes." Fort Belvoir Community Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, May 24, 1999.

Military Traffic Management Command. "Reengineering The DOD's Personal Property Program." Presented to the MTMC Symposium 1999, March 30, 1999.

Military Traffic Management Command. "Information Paper for Brigadier General Privratsky." June 3 1999.

Military Traffic Management Command. Strategic Plan 1998.

Office of the Secretary of Defense. "Full Service Moving Project: A Quality of Life Initiative." Presented to DOD Management.

Office of the Secretary of Defense. "Personal Property Program Management Reform Memorandum #6." 1999.

Office of the Secretary of Defense. "Full Service Moving Project." February 12, 1999.

Paolucci, Danielle and Frederick G. Thorpe. Analysis of the DOD Household Goods/Personal Property Program Within CONUS. Monterey: Naval Postgraduate School, 1995.

United States Transportation Command. "Evaluation Support for DOD's Personal Property Reengineering Programs Statement of Work." 1999.

United States Transportation Command. "Evaluation Plan for Reengineered DOD Personal Property Pilot Program, Service Member-Arranged Move, and DOD Full Service Moving Project." February 4, 1999.

United States Transportation Command. "Personal Property Pilot Program Evaluation Strategy." June 28, 1999.

Websites:

Department of Defense. [<http://www.defenselink.mil/dodreform>]. Accessed June 1999.

General Accounting Office. [<http://www.gao.gov>]. Accessed September 1999.

Military Traffic Management Command. [<http://baileys-mtmcwww.army.mil>]. Accessed July 1999.

United States Transportation Command. [<http://ustcweb.safb.af.mil>]. Accessed June 1999.

Congressional Testimony:

Coburn, John G., Lieutenant General, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Groover, Jr., L. Clyde, Chairman of the Military Mobility Coalition. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Harrison, Joe, President of the AMSA. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Head, Terry, President of the HGFA. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Kallock, Roger W., Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics). Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999

Thompson, Roger G., Lieutenant General, Commander in Chief, United States Transportation Command. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Warren, David R., Director, Defense Management Issues, General Accounting Office. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Military Readiness Subcommittee. Washington, D.C., March 18, 1999.

Interviews:

Interview with Robin Baldwin, Contracting Officer, Full Service Moving Project by electronic correspondence, and author on August 18, 1999.

Interview with Larry N. Campbell, United States Transportation Command by electronic correspondence, and author on August 20, 1999.

Interview with Richard G. Klien, Project Manager, Service-Member Arranged Move by electronic correspondence, and author on August 16, 1999.

Interview with Nomi R. Taslitt, General Accounting Office by electronic correspondence, and author on August 10, 1999.

Interview with Lisa Roberts, Deputy Project Manager, Full Service Moving Project by electronic correspondence, and author, on August 30, 1999.

Interview with Anne Statland, Deputy Project Manager, Military Traffic Management Command Pilot by electronic correspondence, and author on August 16, 1999.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center 2
8725 John J. Kingman Rd., STE 0944
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

2. Dudley Knox Library 2
Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Rd.
Monterey, CA 93943-5101

3. Director, Training and Education 1
MCCDC, Code C46
1019 Elliot Rd.
Quantico, VA 22134-5027

4. Director, Marine Corps Research Center 2
MCCDC, Code C40RC
2040 Broadway Street
Quantico, VA 22134-5107

5. Director, Studies and Analysis Division 1
MCCDC, Code C45
300 Russell Rd.
Quantico, VA 22134-5130

6. Marine Corps Tactical Systems Support Activity 1
Technical Advisory Branch
Attn: Maj. J.C. Cummiskey
Box 555171
Camp Pendleton, CA 92055-5080

7. Marine Corps Representative 1
Naval Postgraduate School
Code 037, Bldg. 234, HA-220
699 Dyer Road
Monterey, CA 93940

8. Prof. Nancy C. Roberts (Code SM/Rc) 1
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5103

9. Prof. Cary Simon (Code SM/Sn)..... 1
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5103
10. USTRANSCOM TCJ4-LTP..... 1
ATTN: Larry N. Campbell
508 Scott Drive
Scott AFB, IL 62225-5357
11. Nomi Taslitt..... 1
3609 Tallwood Terrace
Falls Church, VA 22041
12. DoD Full Service Moving Project..... 1
1401 Wilson Blvd., Suite 400
Attn: Robin Baldwin
Arlington, VA 22209
13. Mr. John R. Randt 1
Director, Public Affairs
HQMTMC (MTPA)
5611 Columbia Pike
Falls Church, VA 22041-5050
14. Captain Michael D. Lepson, USMC 2
1520 Copeland Road
Baltimore, MD 21228